

CQ

SCIENCES ✓

✓ DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY APR 11 1961

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY  
**Weekly Report**

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XIX  
PAGES 601 - 629

**No. 14**

WEEK ENDING APRIL 7, 1961

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Congressional score	ii
and The itol	609
tical es	610
or ion	612
mittee ndup	614
n's ad	629
k In gress	iv

**Problems of the  
Regulatory Agencies**

*Page 601*

**FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES  
DECLINE SLIGHTLY IN 1960**

*Page 615*

**Religions  
of  
Congressmen**

*Page 626*

**Task  
Forces  
Appraised**

*Page 620*

**Education Bill Lobbying**

*Page 624*

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

*The Authoritative Reference on Congress*

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON 6, p. C. • FEderal 8-4660

COPYRIGHT 1961

# Congressional Boxscore

## MAJOR LEGISLATION IN 87th CONGRESS

As of April 7, 1961

### Party Lineups

	Dem.	GOP	Vacancies
HOUSE	260	172	5
SENATE	65	35	0

BILL	HOUSE	SENATE	STATUS		
Depressed Areas (S 1) (HR 4569)	Reported 3/22/61	Passed 3/29/61	Reported 3/8/61	Passed 3/15/61	To Conference
Minimum Wage (S 1457, S 895) (HR 3935)	Reported 3/13/61	Passed 3/24/61	Sent to Full Committee		
Aid to Education (S 1021) (HR 4970)	Hearings Completed		Hearings Completed		
College Aid (S 1241) (HR 5266)	Hearings Completed				
Omnibus Housing (S 1478) (HR 6028)			Hearings Underway		
Temporary Unemployment Benefits (HR 4806)	Reported 2/25/61	Passed 3/1/61	Reported 3/15/61	Passed 3/16/61	PL 87-6 3/24/61
Medical Aid to the Aged (S 909) (HR 4222)					
Social Security Changes (HR 6027)	Ordered Reported				
Dependent Children Aid (HR 4884)	Reported 2/27/61	Passed 3/10/61			
Sugar Act Extension (HR 5463)	Reported 3/14/61	Passed 3/21/61	Reported 3/28/61	Passed 3/29/61	PL 87-15 3/31/61
Feed Grains Program (S 993) (HR 4510)	Reported 2/27/61	Passed 3/9/61	Reported 3/2/61	Passed 3/10/61	PL 87-5 3/22/61
Migrant Farm Workers (HR 2010)	Reported by Subcommittee				
"Food for Peace" — PL 480					
Mutual Security					
OECD Treaty (Exec. E, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.)	No House Action Needed		Reported 3/8/61	Passed 3/16/61	Signed 3/23/61
Peace Corps					
Reorganization Act (S 153)	Reported 3/23/61	Passed 3/29/61	Reported 1/30/61	Passed 2/6/61	To President
Judgeships (S 912)	Reported 3/30/61		Reported 2/28/61	Passed 3/3/61	
Civil Rights					
Tax Revision					
Highway Financing	Hearings Completed				
Water Pollution (S 861) (HR 4036)	Hearings Completed				
Mass Transportation (S 345)			Hearings Completed		
Airport Grants					
Regulatory Agency Reform					

#### CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

A service for editors and standard reference on U.S. Congress

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: Elizabeth J. Brenner, Robert C. Keith, William A. Korn, Helene C. Monberg, Neal R. Peirce, Spencer A. Rich.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatnuck, Ruth Hussey, Elizabeth M. James, Carolyn Mathiasen, Gladys Miller, Jonas V. Morris, David C. Niblack, Shirley Seib, Wayne Walker, Edward T. Walsh.

C.Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Roberto E. Russell, James C. Whittemore.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin, Jr.

Copyright 1961 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

## REFORMS PROPOSED FOR REGULATORY AGENCIES

A decade of exposé and criticism has led to Congressional and Executive concern for the independent federal regulatory agencies. The more colorful disclosures of unethical conduct, extra-legal activity and "influence-peddling" have tended to obscure other serious shortcomings found in the agencies, such as, cumbersome, red-tape-laden operations, intolerable delays, confusing and overlapping jurisdictions, and personnel turnover.

Specific proposals for reform are due soon in the form of a Presidential message on regulatory agencies, a Senate Subcommittee's legislative recommendations and a House Subcommittee's start on technical studies of agency operations. This Fact Sheet examines problems faced by the regulatory agencies and some proposed solutions.

### Background

A Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee chaired by Sen. J. William Fulbright (D Ark.) conducted an investigation in 1950-51 which found that loans had been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on the basis of favoritism and influence. A pastel mink coat given to a White House secretary figured in the probe, and the mink coat became a major campaign issue in the 1952 Presidential election. (1951 Almanac, p. 498)

A House Oversight Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted a much broader investigation of the federal regulatory agencies from 1958-60. Rep. Oren Harris (D Ark.) was chairman; Rep. John B. Bennett (R Mich.) was ranking Republican member. The investigation disclosed that Bernard Goldfine, a Boston industrialist, had presented gifts, including a vicuna coat, to Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, allegedly for Adams' intercession through the White House for Goldfine with two regulatory agencies. The disclosures forced Adams' resignation on Sept. 22, 1958.

The Subcommittee also discovered payola and quiz-show rigging was widespread on television and radio programs. These investigations resulted in the enactment in 1960 of a law (PL 86-752, 86th Congress) prohibiting rigging of television quiz shows and penalizing failure to disclose payola and other deceptive practices in the communications field.

The Subcommittee disclosed irregularities in the granting of television licenses by the Federal Communications Commission which not only resulted in legal action against several witnesses who had appeared before the Subcommittee but in overturning the Commission's licensing awards on court appeal (1958 Almanac p. 687; 1959 Almanac, p. 741; 1960 Almanac, p. 728).

A new Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee was established in 1959 to consider proposals to amend the 1946 Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237, 5 USCA 1001-1011) under which the regulatory agencies operate. Sen. John A. Carroll (D Colo.) was made chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure and Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R Ill.), the ranking Republican

### Rise of Administrative Law

"The rise of administrative bodies probably has been the most significant legal trend of the last century and perhaps more values today are affected by their decisions than by those of all the courts, review of administrative decisions apart. They also have begun to have important consequences on personal rights," said Justice Robert H. Jackson in *FTC v. Ruberoid Co.*, 343 US 470, 487 (1952) in his dissenting opinion.

"Administrative law is the most important category of law current in our land....Every constituent element of the national commerce and industry is grist for the administrative mill. Visualize, if you will, the combined place in the national economy of the railroads, the motor trucks and busses, airlines, radio and television, patents, taxes, gas and oil supplies, issuance of securities, labor relations, the market price of money, and the use of atomic energy. The nub of it is that the federal administrative agencies control our national economy through control of its means of operation....

"Something new has been added to the life of our people in our day. It is the concern of the government in our living. It involves a tremendous conglomeration of rules and rights....It is high time for us as lawyers to realize the importance of the administrative agencies and to give them a major part of our attention....We must do so because of the constructive part agencies should play in our national economy and also because of the destructive part they can play in impingement upon individual human rights. Protection of the public interest in both directions is possible only if administrative law is in fact the 'rule of law' in the full Anglo-American sense of that term."

From *Trial by Agency* by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, The Virginia Law Review Association, Charlottesville, 1959.

member. (1959 Almanac, p. 743) A similar Subcommittee was established in February in the House Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Rep. Francis E. Walter (D Pa.).

### Presidential Concern

As a result of the revelations of the House Oversight Subcommittee, former President Eisenhower on Aug. 29, 1960, appointed Judge E. Barrett Prettyman of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to serve as temporary chairman of a reactivated White House conference originally created in 1953 to study the procedures of the federal administrative agencies. Organization of the new conference is not yet complete.

During the 1960 Presidential campaign, John F. Kennedy promised on Oct. 17, 1960 to submit to Congress "at the earliest possible opportunity" a code of ethics for federal employees. "It would also be my intention through Executive orders, the appointing power and legislation to reform and streamline our lagging administrative agencies," he stated. He noted that it now often takes several years to get a decision out of these agencies, and "justice delayed is justice denied."

After he was elected President, Mr. Kennedy on Nov. 10, 1960 appointed James M. Landis, former chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to make a study of the federal regulatory agencies. Landis reported on Dec. 21, 1960. His report was an indictment of the regulatory agencies' policies and procedures, and it recommended sweeping changes in both. (1960 Almanac, p. 733; 1960 Weekly Report, p. 2019)

What are the federal regulatory agencies, what are their problems, and what are some of the suggested solutions to these problems?

### What They Are

The Congressional Directory lists 63 independent agencies which are not within one of the 10 Executive Departments. They range from the powerful Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created by Congress in 1887 to regulate the fast-growing railroad industry, to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which was created by Congress in 1958. (1958 Almanac p. 160)

Most of the independent agencies are small and obscure. But the traditional "big seven" regulate vital areas of our national industrial economy. Four of these agencies are licensing agencies. They are the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Federal Communications Commission, created in 1934 to license radio, and later television, stations; the Civil Aeronautics Board, created in 1940 to license air carriers; and the Federal Power Commission, created in 1920 to license hydro-electric projects and, later, to regulate the interstate transportation and sale of natural gas. Three of the "big seven" are enforcement agencies. They are the Federal Trade Commission, created in 1914 to regulate various trade and business practices, the Securities and Exchange Commission, created in 1934 to register securities and to regulate the national security exchanges, and the National Labor Relations Board, created in 1935 to regulate industrial labor relations.

These agencies operate under the statutory authority vested in them by Congress in the acts creating them and in subsequent statutes. They also operate under the 1946 Administrative Procedure Act which established the administrative procedure under which they make rules, issue orders, grant licenses and apply sanctions. The statutes creating the agencies, others delegating authority to them and the Administrative Procedure Act form the body of administrative law under which agencies have the power to determine both public and private rights and obligations by regulation or by individual decision. Agency decisions and procedures are subject to the guarantees of the Constitution which provide that no one shall "be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Administrative decisions involving private rights are subject to court review.

### Headless Branch of Government?

The independent agencies straddle the separation-of-powers doctrine of the Constitution. They have been frequently called "the headless fourth branch of government." Their blurred status and functions create many of their problems. In addition to administering the law, which is an executive function, they have quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions.

Rule-making and rate-making are legislative functions. These functions have been delegated to the independent agencies by Congress to implement basic laws and declared Congressional purposes within the framework of those laws. As agents or arms of Congress they have no discretion outside the framework of their statutory authority. But the framework of the law is often shadowy, and the courts have taken judicial notice of that fact.

The process by which an agency formulates an order or a decision is an adjudicative or judicial function. When carrying out its adjudicative function, a regulatory agency is expected to make its decision as a judge would in a court of law -- ie., solely on the basis of the hearing and the written record.

Any attempt to influence the decision of a regulatory board or commission in adversary proceedings -- a contested case -- after the case is at the hearing stage is generally held to be as improper as an attempt to try to influence a judge's decision. Members of commissions and boards may consult with parties to a proceeding while rule-making but not while adjudicating. But there is no well-defined line, and what a commissioner learns while performing his rule-making function may affect the decision he makes in his adjudicative role. Furthermore, many persons do not know what stage a proceeding is in when they contact commissioners and board members. In addition, many commissioners and board members are not attorneys, so judicial procedures are not inbred in them.

Often the financial stakes are so high and the competition is so keen in licensing proceedings that the temptation is great for the contesting parties to try to influence the decision by whatever means.

Although the regulatory agencies are nominally independent of the Executive branch of the government, the President in fact has considerable control over them. The President has the authority, subject to Senate confirmation, to appoint the members of the boards and commissions, including, in most instances, the chairman. Their annual budgets and their legislative recommendations go through the Budget Bureau.

But in *Humphrey's Executor vs. United States* 295 U.S. 602 (1935), a landmark case in administrative law, the Supreme Court ruled that the President cannot dismiss -- with or without the consent of the Senate -- any member of an independent agency with quasi-judicial functions if the member has a statutory term. In this case, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, following his election in 1932, sought to remove W.E. Humphrey as Federal Trade Commissioner and replace him with James M. Landis, now President Kennedy's advisor on the regulatory agencies, on the ground that Humphrey and Mr. Roosevelt did not see eye to eye on "either the policies or the administering" of FTC. Humphrey resisted this attack on the independence of the FTC, and he and later his executor successfully fought the attempted ouster in the courts.

## Problems of the Agencies

Reports of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of James M. Landis to President Kennedy on the regulatory agencies, plus Congressional Quarterly interviews with experts in the field of administrative law, indicate that the following are the major problems now afflicting these agencies and the most significant proposals which have been made to deal with them:

**1. DELAY.** This is the overriding problem both from the standpoint of the public interest and from the standpoint of parties involved in cases before many regulatory agencies. The House Subcommittee attributes the chief causes of delay to lack of clear policies and standards, lack of long-range planning, excessive red tape, unnecessarily-prolonged hearings, and statutory conflicts which force certain agencies to perform conflicting duties of promotion and regulation.

A case often is before a regulatory agency for several years before it is finally decided, particularly if it is complicated. Delays sometimes breed excessive, almost prohibitive costs for some parties involved, particularly small businessmen. They also breed inequities as license holders use delaying tactics to keep competitors out of their market areas.

Some experts assign part of the blame for America's slow economic growth to delays in administrative agencies which hinder industries from making long-range expansion plans. A Brookings Institution report has charged that procedural delays at the Civil Aeronautics Board actually hindered the development of the jet age in American aviation. Robert W. Lishman, chief counsel of the House Oversight Subcommittee, said the House Subcommittee staff found that existing CAB route certificate holders sometimes reaped "a monopoly profit" by prolonging cases. Expenses of proceedings are paid for by taxpayers in the form of subsidies, service mail pay, tax deductions or in higher fares or cargo rates, not to mention delay in expanded air service, he said.

Landis and the Senate Subcommittee have charged that delays in Federal Power Commission decisions on natural gas rate applications have resulted in one rate increase being pancaked upon another to the consuming public under a procedure which allows the requested rates to go into effect subject to a final FPC decision and possible refunds. Lishman said the House Subcommittee staff found that the expense of FPC proceedings is "loaded into the cost of service and the result is higher gas and electric rates" to consumers. Carroll has recommended the enactment of legislation "to protect consumers from delays by which utilities have been able to amass capital by filing unjustified applications for rate increases." Harris favors enactment of legislation to speed up FPC proceedings so consumers do not have to wait for years to be included in a new marketing area for natural gas.

**2. QUALITY OF PERSONNEL.** There has been widespread criticism that the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations have filled many top positions in the federal regulatory agencies with political appointees, even political hacks, who have not had the ability or background to handle properly their key posts, or the willingness to keep up with the heavy work load in many of the agencies by expediting cases. The Senate has been criticized for consenting to poor appointments.

Lack of imagination, inertia, inability to move ahead with the backlog of work and political pressures at the top have tended to demoralize and frustrate the staffs of the agencies, according to many critics who allege that the quality of the staffs, or career employees, of the agencies also has declined during the past two decades.

"Without adequate personnel," Landis told the Federal Bar Association on Jan. 31, "whatever else we choose to do is meaningless." Landis claims that there is an overriding need to appoint to the agencies men and women who have the intelligence and balanced judgment of a judge; the imagination and drive to streamline procedures to keep their dockets up to date; the comprehension to view cases not only on the basis of the past but also on the basis of possible future industrial developments; the courage and independence, stamina and fortitude to stand up to political and industry pressures; and the high standing within their own profession to attract other high-type men and women to become career staff employees in the regulatory agencies.

**3. CHAIRMEN OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS EXERCISE LIMITED AUTHORITY.** Both the House Subcommittee and Landis favor making the chairman the administrative officer for his agency responsible for "housekeeping" problems to free commissions and boards of unnecessary administrative detail so that they might concentrate on the really major policy matters and cases before them. Landis favors giving the President the authority to name the chairman of each regulatory agency, including the Interstate Commerce Commission. Carroll and Landis would give the President the right to remove the chairman of the FPC and to appoint his own chairman. There is presently a conflict of laws on this point. But the House Subcommittee has recommended that the commission or board chairmen be selected by the members of the commissions or boards themselves and should not serve longer than three years' time with removal by the President only for neglect of duty or for malfeasance in office.

**4. STAFF-WRITTEN OPINIONS.** The House Subcommittee and Landis were particularly critical of the practice of having the staff write opinions to justify decisions made by the commissioners. Often such opinions do not jibe with the recommendations of the hearing examiners, the hearing record or past cases. Dirksen has pointed out that charges repeatedly have been made, particularly by practitioners before the agencies, that decisions appear to be made "on the dark side of the moon" by unidentified persons on agency staffs who bear no public responsibility. The House Subcommittee and Landis have recommended that individual commissioners should be assigned the responsibility for each opinion. There has been some improvement in this regard recently in the agencies themselves.

**5. ROLE OF HEARING EXAMINERS.** Although hearing examiners often spend months and even years on hearings on complicated cases before the agencies, at great expense to all concerned, their findings of fact, conclusions of law and their recommendations are often advisory only, and they can be and often are disregarded by their boards and commissions. Appeals from examiners' decisions are presently permitted on relatively minor matters, and it is not unusual for commissioners to try cases de novo, or from the beginning, after they already have been tried by examiners.

Many experts feel that a hearing examiner's findings of facts and recommendations should be automatically adopted by a commission unless there is a showing of

error on petition by a party in interest or unless a case involves a national issue or a major policy decision. Furthermore, they feel that review of the case by a commission should be discretionary with the commission, not a matter of right. At the current rate commissions and boards ignore the findings and recommendations of their examiners, a party in a case cannot be sure that the ultimate decision of a commission or board is based on the record. This lack of assurance tends to destroy public confidence in agency decisions.

Harris has called the hearing examiner in regulatory agencies "of central and crucial importance to the success and integrity of agency adjudication," and he favors higher pay for them. Carroll recommends the enactment of legislation to increase both the power and pay of hearing examiners. He would make their decisions final "in all but the rarest instances." The American Bar Association and many individual members of the bar back numerous proposals to upgrade hearing examiners by giving them the independence, career status, tenure and pay comparable to that of a trial judge. Examiners do not have that status now, and many are regarded as mediocre. Landis told Congressional Quarterly he would like to see hearing examiners try cases in the various agencies to become more familiar with the over-all problems in one field, such as transportation.

**6. JUDICIAL PROCEDURE.** Many experts feel that the hearings before the regulatory agencies are unduly lengthy and cumbersome because facts are developed by examination and cross examination of witnesses as they are in a court of law. One veteran hearing examiner has told Congressional Quarterly that cases are "vastly overtried" in his agency. Yet the tendency in recent years has been toward increasing judicialization of process and procedures within the agencies, ostensibly to meet the due process requirement. However, the requirement that the administrative process must be "due" does not mean that it must be a judicial one. The customary administrative procedure is as much due process as the judicial procedure. The main requirements of due process are that the person or group who tries the facts shall be an impartial tribunal; that no findings shall be made without prior notice to and opportunity to be heard for the party affected, and the observance of fair rules of evidence.

In fact, some experts question whether judicial procedures developed for the courts actually assure the effectiveness of the administrative process in the regulatory agencies. The question is hotly disputed. Louis J. Hector, former member of the CAB, has called the agencies "long on judicial form (detail) and short on judicial substance" in rendering decisions in the broad public interest. Budget Bureau studies indicate that modern fact-gathering and data-processing techniques provide better information more quickly and at less cost in rate-making and licensing cases than the present procedure. The American Bar Association is backing a code of federal administrative procedure to amend and supplant the Administrative Procedure Act. Critics of the proposal claim that lawyers have a kind of proprietary interest in the judicial procedure method and that this proposal would tend to judicialize procedures in the agencies even further. ABA denies this. It claims its code would provide more adequate public information on the procedures and operation of federal agencies, improve rule-making processes, assure fairer and more expeditious hearings and determination of agency cases, and

provide for more effective judicial review of agency action. About the only agreement is that if the present judicial procedural methods now used are to be discarded or modified, the Administrative Procedure Act would have to be extensively amended.

The Senate Subcommittee does not recommend a general revision of the Administrative Procedure Act. It does not look with favor on the ABA proposal, stating that "drastic tinkering with the Administrative Procedure Act is undesirable at this time."

**7. DUAL ROLE.** Some agencies have the authority to operate as accuser, litigant and judge, including the right to prejudge a man as having violated the law even before he has a hearing. Some members of agencies sit in judgment on cases in which they have previously taken a position adverse to the citizen litigant involved. This gives some agencies a powerful weapon to force compliance with their policies, at the expense of individual rights, some critics claim.

Congressional concern about the National Labor Relations Board serving as both prosecutor and judge resulted in separating these functions in 1947. The prosecution functions were given to the general counsel and the adjudicative functions were left in the Board. But the result has not been entirely satisfactory because there are, in effect, two heads of the agency, each claiming jurisdiction over "the twilight zones" of the statutes under which the agency operates. This question is also in hot dispute. Some critics favor giving the adjudicative functions to the courts and leaving the enforcement agencies with prosecutory functions. There have been proposals to establish a Court of Veterans Appeals to try claims cases now handled by the Veterans Administration. The American Bar Association has proposed setting up a labor court and a trade court to handle the adjudicative functions of the NLRB and the Federal Trade Commission. ABA also favors making the Tax Court independent of the Treasury Department. But many men who have served on the regulatory agencies regard the ABA proposals as impractical. Former FTC Chairman Earl W. Kintner and Landis claim that the adjudicatory functions cannot be separated from the policy-making functions of the agencies without destroying the agencies themselves. Their problems are too many-sided to be solved by a separation of functions, they claim.

**8. FRAGMENTED JURISDICTION.** Many agencies now have jurisdiction, in part, over such vitally important fields as transportation, communications and energy. But none has total jurisdiction. The Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, has jurisdiction over railroads, the Civil Aeronautics Board has jurisdiction over airplanes, and the Federal Maritime Board and the Bureau of Public Roads within the Commerce Department have jurisdiction over shipping and highways respectively. Under their limited statutory authority and jurisdiction, they make their decisions without consideration of the impact that they have on other forms of transportation.

The problem is further complicated because jurisdiction of Congressional committees in these fields is likewise split, and the Executive has only limited jurisdiction. The result is a lack of a national policy in the vitally important fields of transportation, communications and energy, according to Landis. This in turn has resulted in stagnation in these fields in recent years, he claims. Some experts regard this fragmentation of jurisdiction, and therefore a lack of total responsibility and a national policy in these fields as a major weakness in

the regulatory agencies and in our very system of government at the present time.

**9. OVERLAPPING JURISDICTION.** There is some overlapping of jurisdiction among the agencies in certain fields. For example, FTC and the Justice Department have overlapping jurisdiction in the field of anti-trust regulation, and FTC and the Food and Drug Administration in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare have overlapping jurisdiction in the regulation of food and drugs. The House Subcommittee has recommended that the agencies report to Congress any areas where they believe they have conflicting or overlapping jurisdiction with other regulatory agencies or federal departments.

**10. LACK OF EFFECTIVE CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.** Congressmen, by and large, strongly maintain that the regulatory agencies are "arms of Congress" because they carry out the rule-making and rate-making functions delegated to them by Congress. Harris told the District of Columbia Bar Association on March 14 that "these regulatory agencies were established by Congress pursuant to its Constitutional mandate to regulate commerce .... They are in a very real sense trustees of these Congressional powers, and their primary accountability is accordingly to the Congress," Harris stated.

Court decisions indicate that the agencies are creatures of Congress. But over the years legislative oversight over the agencies has been sporadic to non-existent except for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which has kept a very close eye on Atomic Energy Commission operations. Congressional hearings and investigations generally have gotten into very narrow areas of inquiry.

In an attempt to remedy this situation in part, Harris on Feb. 28 set up a permanent, regular Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies within the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to succeed the temporary Special Oversight Subcommittee which operated from 1959 to 1961. In a letter to Harris on Dec. 16, 1960, the American Bar Association stated that such a Subcommittee was necessary to provide effective, continuous surveillance over the agencies. Heretofore, the ABA stated, Congress had found it "extremely difficult, if not impossible, to grasp the modus operandi of its own creatures, to measure the merit of their work and to ascertain the current and future validity of their means and ends," because it has not provided continuous, effective oversight over the agencies.

Harris told Congressional Quarterly March 22 that he expected the new Subcommittee to "work into a very fruitful program." One of the first things it will do is launch a series of technical studies to determine how agency operations and procedures can be improved and speeded up. These studies will be done agency-by-agency, he said.

**11. NO LEGISLATIVE ACTION BY CONGRESS.** Lack of continuous legislative oversight by Congress has resulted in a dearth of legislation in a field in which it is extremely difficult to draft acceptable measures. Congress has not made any major change in the 1946 Administrative Procedure Act in 15 years. The studies and investigations of the House Subcommittee during the past three years indicated some new legislation is needed. Bennett told Congressional Quarterly March 2, "I think that the House Oversight Subcommittee made a pretty thorough investigation" of agency problems. "Now it is time for legislative action to end the delays, frustrations and improper pressures," he said. Carroll stated Nov. 30, 1960 as his

## Need for Reappraisal

"A reappraisal of the various functions and activities of the regulatory agencies is desirable at this very critical period of our national life for reasons that are only too apparent. The scope of responsibility entrusted to these agencies is enormous, exceeding in its sweep, from the standpoint of its economic impact perhaps, the powers remaining in the Executive and the Legislative. This is true despite the fact that such powers as they exercise are generally delegated to them by the legislative.

"This delegation followed upon the conviction that the problems in a particular area were so manifold and complex that the Congress simply had neither the time nor the capacity to handle them. Similarly the delegation to them of adjudicatory powers stemmed from the conviction that the issues involved were different from those that theretofore had been traditionally handled by courts and thus were not suited for judicial determination. These delegations, once made, are rarely recalled or retracted; on the contrary, the tendency is to expand them as more and more complex problems arise. The legislative standards under which the delegations are made are similarly increasingly loosened so that not infrequently the guide in the determination of problems that face the agencies is not much more than their conception of the public interest....

"Never before recent times in the history of the administrative process have the federal courts been compelled to return administrative decisions to the agencies, not because they have erred, but because they have departed from those fundamentals of ethics that must characterize equally the performance of quasi-judicial and judicial duties. Cancers such as these sweep through the entire process dulling the sense of public service and destroying the confidence that the public must repose in public servants."

From James M. Landis' report on regulatory agencies, December 1960.

Subcommittee started hearings on the overall problems of the agencies, "It is time for action.... This condition just cannot go on.... It is a waste of time for Congressional committees to hold investigations just to repeat over and over and over, and nothing is done." Many new legislative proposals are now in the drafting stage.

**12. LACK OF EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT.** Aside from the Budget Bureau, "the Executive appears to have had no real concern with the operation of the regulatory agencies" for the past decade, Landis stated in his December report. An Office of Administrative Procedure was established in 1955 within the Department of Justice, but it has not been active. Acting on a Landis proposal, President Kennedy has asked Congress for power to submit reorganization plans to Congress to fit each agency. Landis also recommended that an Office of Regulatory Agencies be created within the Executive Office of the President "to assist the President in discharging his responsibility of assuring the efficient execution of those laws that these agencies administer."

Due to Harris' and Bennett's opposition to this recommendation which they have called the equivalent of

putting a regulatory "czar" in the White House, Kennedy has backed away from the proposal. He told his press conference on Feb. 8, "Whether we should have such a White House liaison or center is a matter which we are going to consider. The Congress bears special responsibility for these agencies and, therefore, I think it is probably not likely that major responsibility in this area would be released to the White House, and I am not completely sure it is wise."

The Senate Subcommittee differs with the House Subcommittee on this point. It believes that day-to-day supervision over the agencies must be carried by the White House. Carroll favors establishing a White House Office of Administration and Reorganization to compile statistics, probe trouble spots in the agencies, prepare reorganization plans and generally provide for "more effective discharge of the public business" by the agencies.

Under President Kennedy, the White House has stepped up its day-to-day interest in the agencies. Frederick G. Dutton, Special Assistant to the President, sent memoranda to chairmen of the regulatory agencies on Feb. 7 requesting that a summary of the agencies' activities be sent him each month. (Weekly Report p. 440)

"The President is most interested in being kept closely informed on important policy and administrative action taken or proposed, and of concern to him as Chief Executive or in his other Constitutional responsibilities. He is particularly interested in having major problems of the agency flagged for his attention," Dutton's memoranda stated.

Republican Members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have raised questions about these memoranda. They indicate Congressional concern about White House domination and influence over the agencies and about the possible extension of Executive privilege to such communications. Harris, however, has arranged to have duplicate copies of the agency summaries sent to the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Committees' chairmen as well as to the White House, in an accord reached between Dutton and himself.

**13. LACK OF JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT.** There is no continuous judicial oversight over the quasi-judicial regulatory agencies at the present time, although legal groups have considered the problems of the agencies for a long time. There appears to be general agreement that a permanent national conference on administrative procedures should be established. The proposal was endorsed by the American Bar Association on Aug. 27, 1959; by the Judicial Conference in February, 1960; and has been backed by Landis and the House and Senate Subcommittees.

Landis has recommended that the proposed administrative conference should have a permanent secretariat and director who would have jurisdiction over hearing examiners and should sponsor regular meetings at which recommendations would be made by representatives of the agencies, the bar and others to improve agency procedures. Many experts feel that such an agency, operating independently, would offer the most basic, if unspectacular, improvements in the administrative agencies of any program now proposed. A similar plan was recently initiated in Britain with good results.

**14. INTERVENTION BY THE PRESIDENT, THE WHITE HOUSE STAFF, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFFS IN CASES BEFORE THE REGULATORY AGENCIES.** The record is replete with such instances. Even a routine inquiry into the status of a case which comes from the White House or

from the office of a highly influential Member of Congress may affect the outcome of a case before the regulatory agencies, according to some experts.

There is much controversy as to the extent that Congressmen have a right to become involved in cases on behalf of their constituents. Dirksen has championed the right of Congress to check at least on the status of a case. But Sen. Kenneth B. Keating (R N.Y.), noted on May 25, 1960, that he felt there was too much Congressional pressure on the agencies. "There is a degree of Congressional responsibility for the plight of the administrative agencies" in this regard "which Congress has not readily discerned," Keating said. Allegations have been made that Senators sometimes privately quiz agency appointees prior to their confirmation to see if their views square with the ideas of the Senators' constituents.

As statutory restraints are sparse in this field, self-restraint on the part of the White House and Congress appears to be about the only protection that the regulatory agencies have now to ward off pressure from these quarters. Part of the problem appears to stem from the unusual status of the regulatory agencies in that they carry out some functions of all three branches of the government, but actually belong to none of them. Part of the problem appears to lie in the failure of some members of the executive and legislative branches to understand the serious question of law and of propriety that is posed when contacts are made with members of boards and commissions in contested proceedings after a case has reached the hearing stage.

Lishman told the Federal Bar Association on Sept. 16, 1960, "In our modern scheme of government the administrator must be respected as an independent specialist and be given the unhampered opportunity of reaching open, fair and impartial decisions. This does not mean his actions should be free from both legislative and executive scrutiny and correction. It does mean, however, that the administrator should not be treated as an appendage of either branch of government or as a dispenser of public largess at the behest of either private or political persons....I wish to call attention to the plight of the administrator caught in a political crossfire (between Congress and the Executive)....In the long run, I sincerely believe the success of the administrative process depends upon the vigorous independence of the administrators," Lishman stated. And, he added, "if the legislative and executive branches maintain a hostile attitude toward administrative independence of judgment, it will not be too long, in my opinion, before undisclosed lobbyists and pressure groups are in control of the administrative process."

**15. INFLUENCE OF BUDGET BUREAU.** Congress is generally uneasy about the influence of the Budget Bureau over the regulatory agencies. The Budget Bureau Administers the agencies' budgets, therefore influencing size and extent of their programs and also their legislative recommendations to Congress.

Although the Bureau claims statutory authority for such power under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the House Subcommittee issued a report in December, 1960, calling Budget's exercise of power over the regulatory agencies censorship of the agencies -- arms of Congress -- by the Executive branch, as the Budget Bureau operates directly under the White House.

The House Subcommittee recommended that the law be changed to require that the original budgetary requests of the agencies be sent to Congress along with the Budget

Bureau revisions, so that Congress might properly exercise its legislative oversight functions over the agencies. It recommended that a study be made to determine the feasibility of having all regulatory agency legislative proposals submitted to Congress as well as to the Budget Bureau.

**16. UNETHICAL CONDUCT.** Much of the criticism directed at the regulatory agencies is based on allegations that a number of the members of the regulatory agencies and their key staff people have either operated against the public interest or that their moral tone is flabby.

The problem of "influence peddling" probably has been magnified out of proportion to the cases of actual unethical conduct. But President Kennedy, the American Bar Association, the House and Senate Subcommittees favor establishing a code of ethics for the regulatory agencies along the line of the Canons of Judicial Ethics. They would also prohibit improper ex parte contacts in contested cases before the regulatory agencies. Ex parte contacts are from one side only, without notice to the other party or parties to a proceeding.

Such legislation is extremely difficult to draft. Approaches to key agency personnel may take the form of subtle persuasion, social favors or promises of future employment. Approaches may also be inquiries as to the status of a matter or prods to get a matter decided. Dirksen claims that to inquire and to prod is a function of a Member of Congress, and he strongly opposes criminal or civil sanctions which would prevent this type of contact. Landis and Carroll have proposed dismissal of federal employees and disbarment proceedings against attorneys found guilty of unethical conduct.

#### **17. LACK OF LONG-RANGE, WELL-FORMULATED POLICIES.**

The agencies are widely criticized for failure to make long-range, well-formulated policies or even to have any policy at all. Unlike the courts, the agencies do not set policy on the basis of previous decisions. Stare decisis, or case precedent, does not apply. An agency decision rendered today often cannot be reconciled at all with a decision made last month. This raises the whole question of whether, in fact, adequate protection is provided by the agencies under the due process provision of the law.

Dirksen has suggested that the policy-making functions of a board or commission should be separated from the policy-application functions. He believes that the boards and commissions should address themselves solely to policy-making functions.

"The policies of the regulatory agencies should be carefully spelled out and publicized so that all would know what their policies are," Dirksen told Congressional Quarterly. "Their rules....should be well known and should apply to and be binding on each side," he said. If the commissioners operated as policy makers, they could look ahead in planning policy, would not be bound by quasi-judicial restrictions, as they are now, and would be able to consult and could be consulted by all citizens, he said.

Dirksen also has proposed that the President should have the right to veto any new policy announced by a regulatory agency and that Congress should have the right to override the President's veto of an agency's policy by a majority vote in the House and Senate. Such proposals would require extensive changes in the law.

**18. FOOT-DRAGGING.** This is one of the most often-repeated complaints about the regulatory boards and commissions. They seem to have great difficulty in

### **Teamwork**

"It is recognized that effective reform of the administrative process requires teamwork between the Executive and the Congress. In a time when united national effort is needed more than ever before in our history to improve the efficiency of our Constitutional system of government, it would be tragic to have a conflict develop between the Executive and Congress over the question of which branch has supreme control over the federal agencies. In this field it must be recognized that the agencies exercise powers delegated to them by Congress and that Congress has the Constitutional responsibility of supervising and overseeing their operations. It must also be recognized that the Executive has the Constitutional responsibility of seeing to the faithful performance of the laws, including the laws creating and defining the activities of the agencies. Moreover, the President has the power of appointment and budget control. Enlightened self-interest requires that these legislative and executive powers and responsibilities not be exercised as though they are in watertight compartments. Each impinges upon the other and an accommodation must be made whereby the executive and legislative powers are harmoniously exercised in the same direction, namely, the just, speedy and efficient administration of the law for the benefit of the national public interest."

From the report of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, January 1961.

making up their collective minds on tough cases, in galvanizing themselves into action to use their statutory authority from Congress to curb abuses in the fields in which they have regulatory authority, or even to suggest deficiencies in their statutory authority or budgets to Congress so that they might solve some of their own problems with new laws and additional funds.

In its report on Jan. 3, 1961, the House Subcommittee said it was its "considered opinion that both the FCC and the FTC had been remiss in not attempting to deal with the problem of quiz-show rigging." It noted that Attorney General Rogers had come to the same conclusion.

Landis has characterized the FPC as "the outstanding example of the breakdown of the administrative process," which he and other critics have attributed to "the unwillingness of the Commission to assume its responsibility under the Natural Gas Act."

Carroll told commission witnesses who appeared before his Subcommittee on November and December, 1960 that the agencies must come to Congress "with a positive program to help solve their own problems." "You have sort of a negative approach," he stated. "If the backlog of cases continues, there is going to be (continued) hammering and embarrassing of this commissioner, this person and commission personnel," he stated.

Landis told the Senate Subcommittee that he had noted in his study of the agencies a growing tendency by commissioners and board members, including chairmen, to try to slough off responsibility in making tough decisions, and to try to get others to share such responsibility.

Lishman has pointed out that the law presently provides no incentive for economy or speed in agency

proceedings, as costs of the proceedings, including legal fees, are included in rate bases, deducted from taxes or paid from subsidy. If Congress limited the amount of costs of the proceedings which could be deducted, passed on or written off, Lishman told Congressional Quarterly, this would be a big incentive to both the boards and commissions and the parties to the proceedings toward economy and speed.

**19. PROBLEMS OF TURNOVER AND REAPPOINTMENT.** Because terms of commissioners and board members of the regulatory agencies range from five to seven years, and because reappointment often depends on the political winds rather than on a commissioner's performance, turnover among the commissioners and board members in the regulatory agencies is high. The average commissioner serves only three years, so few become really expert in the complex fields that they are attempting to regulate. Those who do stay the full length of their terms are particularly vulnerable to political pressure. They must look to the President for reappointment and to the Senate for confirmation. The industries that they regulate often exercise great influence over their reappointment, and they usually have to look to such industries for employment in the event they are not reappointed.

A further complication is that many are older men in moderate circumstances, so that they may have difficulty reestablishing themselves in private industry. In addition, many men are reluctant to take jobs on the regulatory boards and commissions because of the insecurity and political pressures involved.

Many recommendations have been made to improve the pay, pension rights and tenure to get good men and to get them to stay the full length of their terms. Dirksen has suggested that commissioners and board members be appointed for 15-year terms with no right to reappointment, like the Comptroller General. Carroll has recommended 10-year terms for all members of the regulatory agencies, together with an annual increment in salary and with provisions for more adequate pensions. These Senators point out that long terms and job security tend to "increase the calibre and effectiveness of the men who hold office." Roger Jones, former chairman of the Civil Service Commission, agrees. But he reminded the Senate Subcommittee in December that "security of tenure is not a substitute for guts."

**20. UNREVIEWABLE DISCRETION.** There is some complaint among attorneys that the regulatory agencies, by and large, have virtually unreviewable discretion because courts will not reverse their decisions unless they exceed their statutory jurisdiction or their decisions are arbitrary, or they are not based on substantial evidence.

The Senate Subcommittee has recommended the enactment of legislation to minimize the difficulties of obtaining speedy and convenient judicial review of agency decisions. It stated that "citizens who feel aggrieved by the action of a government agency should be permitted to obtain judicial review of that action on the merits of the dispute."

In recent years the courts have returned some licensing cases for reconsideration to the agencies because of unethical conduct of the parties involved.

**21. LACK OF PUBLIC, PRESS INTEREST IN THE AGENCIES.** Congressmen dealing with the problems of regulatory agencies report that it is almost impossible to get the public or the press interested in the regulatory agencies unless a scandal is uncovered. Few newspapers have large enough staffs to cover the many regulatory agencies,

and few reporters want the assignment because of the complexity of the work. So most press coverage is sporadic and superficial. Prior to the December Landis report, most of the studies made on the problems of the administrative agencies went unreported in the press.

## Outlook

Following the Easter holidays, stepped-up activity relative to the regulatory agencies is expected both at the Congressional and White House level.

Harris's newly constituted Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies will begin its work by launching the series of technical studies on agency operations, as previously noted. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, in a subcommittee print submitted to the full Committee in March, made nine legislative recommendations designed to speed up and improve the work of the agencies. They are: "to provide sanctions for violation of a Presidential code of ethics; to provide criminal and civil sanctions for the use of *ex parte* influence; to set up a White House Office of Administration and Reorganization; to provide uniform ten-year terms, increased status and security to attract top men to the field; to increase the authority and compensation of hearing examiners; to make a continuing body of the Conference on Administrative Procedure; to protect the public from costly delays in the decisions of rate cases; and to expedite the judicial review of agency decisions. The Subcommittee does not recommend a general revision of the Administrative Procedure Act."

Dirksen concurred in many of the recommendations of the Democratic majority of the Subcommittee listed above. But he filed separate views in which he urged the enactment of legislation to provide 15-year terms for members of the commissions with no right to reappointment. He also recommended separating the policy-making and policy-applications functions of the agencies so that members of the boards and commissions may concentrate on long-range, well-formulated policies.

President Kennedy will send a message to Congress on his recommendations to reorganize and streamline the administrative agencies and to submit a code of ethics for federal employees. It is also expected that he will issue an Executive Order giving official status to the reactivated White House conference to study the procedures of the federal administrative agencies.

Landis told Congressional Quarterly March 24 that the President's message would be "somewhat in line" with Landis' recommendations in his report to Mr. Kennedy in December. The Kennedy message was originally scheduled to be sent to the Congress April 3. But Carroll met with the President March 25 to ask Mr. Kennedy to delay the White House message pending publication of the Senate Subcommittee report. Both Carroll and Dirksen hope that the Presidential message will pick up their recommendations.

Both Carroll and Harris profess to be optimistic about progress in this highly complex field. Carroll told Congressional Quarterly March 25, "I thanked the President for his leadership in this field, and I said that I hoped it would continue so that new life will be instilled in the regulatory agencies."

Harris told Congressional Quarterly that he believes the agencies actually will break the log-jam of delays on their decisions "in another three years" if given the proper legislative tools to do so.



## Around The Capitol

### MENTAL HEALTH

In a report to Congress, the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health March 23 proposed a "national mental health program" which would include federal funds for the treatment of patients. The Commission was established by Congress July 28, 1955 (PL 84-182), and its report was the result of a five-year study of mental health care.

Among the findings: State mental hospitals currently were not used as true hospitals, but as "dumping grounds for social rejects;" 80 percent of the nation's 277 state mental hospitals had not employed new techniques which would have made them treatment centers rather than custodial institutions; state mental hospitals carried a daily load of 540,000 patients, and over half of these "receive no active treatment of any kind designed to improve their mental conditions;" many patients should not have been committed to hospitals but should have received out-patient care at Mental Health Clinics; with modern techniques the schizophrenic has at least a three-in-five chance for return to society as a useful citizen.

Among the Commission's proposals: the setting of a national goal of one mental health clinic for every 50,000 persons; gradual conversion of all existing mental hospitals of over 1,000 beds into treatment centers for all chronic illness, including mental illness; conversion of mental hospitals with no more than 1,000 beds into intensive treatment centers for the mentally ill; more and better use of non-medical mental health workers with proper consultation and supervision and expanded recruitment for mental health careers ("The state hospital must cease to be treated as a target for political exploitation" and "patronage"; hospitals and clinics must be manned "by properly motivated career workers and not by hacks," the Commission said.); increased use of preventive counseling to moderate stress at early stages of disturbance; provision for immediate care of acutely disturbed persons at the onset of their illness; establishment of aftercare, intermediate care and rehabilitation services to restore the mentally ill to useful lives as soon as possible.

In the research area, the Commission recommended more emphasis on long-term research projects and more funds for basic research; expansion of National Institutes of Health research programs; establishment of mental health research centers in collaboration with educational institutions and training centers and independently; and increased funds for construction of research facilities.

In a "hypothetical" projection of costs, the Commission said current expenditures from all sources for public care of the mentally ill, estimated to be \$1 billion annually, would be doubled within five years and tripled within ten under the proposed program, with the Federal Government providing \$1.75 billion of the \$3 billion expended in the tenth year. (Under existing programs, the Federal Government provided grants only for research and training in the mental health field. In 1960, an amendment to the Social Security bill (HR 12580) offered by Sen. Russell B. Long (D La.) would have provided federal

matching grants for care of aged mental and tubercular patients under the Old Age Assistance welfare program and the new program for the "medically needy" aged. The Senate accepted the amendment by a 51-38 roll call, but it was rejected in Conference. 1960 Almanac p. 162)

Thirty-six National organizations and 45 individuals active in the mental health fields participated in the Commission.

**RELATED DEVELOPMENT** -- April 5 -- Surgeon General Luther E. Terry announced that he had written to all state Governors urging consideration of the findings of the Surgeon General's Ad Hoc Committee on planning for mental health facilities. The Committee, comprised of State Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Authorities and State Mental Health Authorities, recommended the establishment of community-based mental health facilities and rehabilitation programs as part of a system of statewide health services. The Committee said construction and expansion of large mental institutions should be "strongly discouraged" and state activities should be directed toward smaller community or regional facilities. The report recommended that each Governor consider steps to stimulate the development of "a comprehensive plan for mental health facilities," and that the states provide financing and enabling legislation to carry out the plan.

### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

President Kennedy April 3 named the public members to serve on the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, established March 6 under the chairmanship of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, to combat racial discrimination in the employment policies of Government agencies and private firms holding Government contracts. (Weekly Report p. 391)

The appointees (asterisks denote those who served previously on the President's Committee on Government contracts, which the new body replaced): Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff; Fred Lazarus Jr.\*, chairman of the board of the Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati; Donald C. Cook, executive vice president of the American Gas and Electric Service Corporation; George Meany\*, president of the AFL-CIO; Edgar F. Kaiser, president, Kaiser Engineers, Henry J. Kaiser Company and Willys Motors, Inc.; Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Dean of Washington Cathedral; Walter P. Reuther\*, president of the United Automobile Workers Union (AFL-CIO); John H. Wheeler, president of the Mechanics and Farmers Bank, Durham, N.C. and a member of the National Negro Bankers Association; Howard B. Woods, executive editor of the St. Louis Argus; Rabbi Jacob Joseph Weinstein of Chicago; the Very Reverend Monsignor George G. Higgins, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Robert B. Troutman, Atlanta, Ga., a member of the law firm of Spalding, Sibley, Troutman, Meadow and Smith; Silliman Evans Jr., publisher of the Nashville, Tennessee; Mrs. Mary Lasker, philanthropist and founder of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation; and Howard E. Butt Jr., vice president of the H.E.B. Grocery Company and a Baptist lay minister.

## REAPPORTIONMENT

Rep. Frank Chelf (D Ky.), leader of a group of Representatives favoring an increase in the permanent membership of the House, April 1 announced plans to file a petition to discharge from the House Judiciary Committee Chelf's bill (HR 3725) to increase the permanent House membership from 435 to 469. He said the discharge petition was necessary because of opposition by House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D Texas). Chelf said Rayburn had told House Judiciary Chairman Emanuel Celler (D N.Y.) "not to conduct hearings and to take no action on the bill." (According to associates, Rayburn "feels if you get this thing started it'll become regular every 10 years.") (For background on House reapportionment, see Weekly Report p. 274)

After polling 200 members from 16 states slated to lose seats under the present system, Chelf said 105 agreed to sign a discharge petition, 56 refused, and 39 made no commitment. He said he felt "confident that we will get the necessary number" (219 signatures).

Chelf said it was "absolutely necessary that there be action one way or the other so state legislatures will know what to do. Many states are holding back re-districting programs because they are not certain how many seats they will have. If we wait too long it may be too late for some of the states to act, and the result would be a monumental mess in the 1962 Congressional elections." Chelf also said an increase in membership would avoid "political gerrymandering" through re-districting.

## TEXAS SENATE RACE

Republican John G. Tower and incumbent Sen. William A. Blakley (D), both avowed conservatives, April 4 led a field of 71 candidates in a special Texas Senate election to fill the seat vacated by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. Tower and Blakley thus assured for themselves the two places in the runoff election required by Texas state law, which Gov. Price Daniel (D) has indicated he will call for June 3.

Although unofficial returns gave Tower, the only Republican in the race, a substantial lead over his nearest rival, the combined vote of the five leading Democrats was more than twice Tower's vote.

During his campaign, Tower said he opposed Social Security medical care, federal aid to education, further extension of the minimum wage and other parts of the Kennedy program. Sen. Barry Goldwater (R Ariz.) actively campaigned for Tower.

In 1960 Tower was defeated for the Senate by Johnson. Tower received 926,653 votes for 41.1 percent of the total.

Blakley, serving under an interim appointment, has identified himself with the Southern wing of the Democratic party in the Senate. He said during the campaign that President Kennedy's program for aid to depressed areas was a "blueprint for socialism."

Rep. James C. Wright Jr. (D), who finished third, said he would support "most of the Kennedy program" if elected to the Senate.

Texas Attorney General Will Wilson of Dallas, generally identified as a moderate or middle-of-the-road candidate, ran fourth.

Former State Rep. Maury Maverick Jr. of San Antonio, who enjoyed state AFL-CIO endorsement, was fifth. He was regarded as a liberal candidate, as was State Senator Henry B. Gonzales, who finished sixth.

Incomplete, unofficial returns gave the following vote:

Tower	324,465	31.5%
Blakley	188,809	18.3
Wright	168,826	16.4
Wilson	121,234	11.8
Maverick	104,499	10.1
Gonzales	96,477	9.4
Others	25,793	2.5

Total Vote Reported 1,030,103 100.0

## BIRCH SOCIETY MEMBERS

Rep. Edgar W. Hiestand (R Calif.) March 30 identified himself as a member of the ultra-conservative John Birch Society, a semi-secret organization formed in 1958 by Robert H.W. Welch, retired Boston candy manufacturer, for the avowed purpose of fighting communism. Hiestand March 31 identified Rep. John H. Rousselot (R Calif.) as a member of the society, and said "I am quite sure there are others."

The Birch society is named after an American Army Captain who was executed by the Chinese Communists in August 1945 while on an intelligence mission for the Office of Strategic Services. The society has come under heavy criticism from large segments of the press and several Members of Congress. Particular criticism has been levelled at past statements by Welch charging that former President Eisenhower, Chief Justice Earl Warren, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Central Intelligence Agency Director Allen Dulles were Communist agents or sympathizers.

Among the Members of Congress who have criticized the Birch Society are Sens. Milton R. Young (R N.D.), Thomas H. Kuchel (R Calif.), Gale W. McGee (D Wyo.), Thomas J. Dodd (D Conn.), Stephen M. Young (D Ohio); and House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D Texas). The generally conservative Los Angeles Times criticized the organization in a March 12 editorial, and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon wrote the paper supporting its stand against the Birch Society's methods.

Rep. Gordon H. Scherer (R Ohio) March 31 said he was not a member of the Birch Society but has "looked favorably on this organization."

Rousselot April 2 said he joined the Birch Society several months ago "because I believe that, in the main, the society is designed to oppose the Communist threat in a positive, legal and correct way."

Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D S.C.) March 2 defended the organization and praised its efforts to bring about Chief Justice Warren's impeachment.

Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R Ariz.) April 4 said he had rejected months ago an offer to become a member of

the Birch Society. He said April 1 he did not agree with the group's desire to impeach Warren. He said he disagreed with many of the organization's theories but was impressed by some of the people in it.

House Un-American Activities Committee Chairman Francis E. Walter (D Pa.) March 30 said he had ordered a preliminary inquiry by his Committee's staff into the Birch Society's activities, but that he doubted the Committee's jurisdiction.

Welch April 1 made public a telegram he had sent to Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Chairman James O. Eastland (D Miss.) asking an investigation of the organization. He said in the telegram, "None of our members will plead the Fifth Amendment."

A Justice Department spokesman March 31 said the Birch Society had become "a matter of concern to the Attorney General" (Robert F. Kennedy.)

## ST. LOUIS MAYORALTY

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker (D) of St. Louis April 4 won a third four-year term by defeating Ben H. Lindenbusch (R), an automobile dealer making his first bid for public office, by a margin of 41,428 votes. Complete, unofficial returns showed:

Tucker	100,899	62.9%
Lindenbusch	59,471	37.1

The Tucker victory dashed Republican hopes of making a comeback in the first large city election since the 1960 elections. Republican National Chairman Thruston B. Morton in February identified St. Louis as a key GOP target for 1961 and the party sent in such top party campaigners as Sen. Barry Goldwater (R Ariz.) and Assistant National Chairman Clare B. Williams.

The Republican city organization, which has suffered from serious factional splits in past years, was spurred to unified action by the results of the March 7 Democratic primary in which Tucker was almost defeated by Democratic National Committeeman Mark R. Holloran (D).

In the campaign, Lindenbusch said Tucker had conducted a "tired, disinterested" administration which was responsible for the city's 100,000 population decline between 1950 and 1960. He said Tucker had neglected the outlying areas of the city "for his own downtown interests." He said Tucker was not interested in the welfare of the city's Negro population and said that though large areas of slums had been razed in center city, no new housing had yet been provided for the displaced Negro population.

Tucker, pushed into a more active campaign than he had found necessary in previous years, defended his race relations record and accused Lindenbusch of "a direct and absolute falsehood" in saying that Tucker had never gone on record for legislation against racial discrimination in places of public accommodation. Tucker said the Lindenbusch campaign was being run by Republican professionals from outside the city and that Lindenbusch was "a guinea pig of the Republican National Committee." Tucker pointed to slum clearance, urban renewal and expressway construction under his administration.

Democratic elements unified behind Tucker in the campaign and Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, was called in to campaign for the Democratic ticket.

Republicans, seeking to improve their big city organizational methods, called 200,000 St. Louis voters to determine which were Republicans and then listed them on poll sheets which were checked on election day. Precinct organizational efforts were bolstered by establishment of a special anti-fraud school and assignment of a special squad of 40 deputies to work in the "tough" precincts on election day.

Both the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Globe-Democrat supported Tucker for re-election. The Post-Dispatch said editorially that Lindenbusch had "failed to demonstrate qualities of character and insight that would offset his deficiencies in experience and public service," and that "having waged a nasty and irresponsible campaign, (Lindenbusch) does not deserve to be considered for the office of Mayor."

Tucker's 62.9 percent share of the vote in 1961 compared to 63.6 percent in his first election in 1953 and 76.8 percent in his 1957 re-election bid. President Kennedy received 66.6 percent of the St. Louis vote in 1960.

## LOS ANGELES MAYORALTY

Mayor Norris Poulson of Los Angeles, a former Republican Representative (1943-53), April 4 ran ahead of a field of eight candidates in the city's nonpartisan mayoralty election but failed to receive a majority of the vote. He will face former Rep. Samuel W. Yorty (D 1951-55) in a May 31 run-off election. Running third in the April 4 election was City Councilman Patrick D. McGee (D). The complete, unofficial totals for the three top candidates:

Poulson	179,273	43.0%*
Yorty	122,478	29.3
McGee	115,635	27.7

\*Percentages are those of the vote for the top three candidates only.

There was a scattering of votes for five other candidates.

In 1957 Poulson was elected to a second four-year term by a landslide in the first election, so that no run-off was required.

## NIXON SPEECHES PLANNED

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon April 4 said "the five-month honeymoon is over" and that he will begin public appraisal of the Kennedy Administration with a May 5 speech in Chicago and similar addresses in Des Moines and Detroit.

## POLITICAL BRIEFS

INDIANA -- Sen. Homer E. Capehart (R Ind.) March 29 announced he would seek a fourth six-year Senate term in 1962.

MICHIGAN -- Michigan Democrats were generally victorious in the April 3 election for various statewide posts. State Highway Commissioner John C. Mackie (D) won by a large plurality and Democrats won six of eight policy-making educational posts. Republican-backed candidates won the two non-partisan Supreme Court Justice elections. The voters approved calling a constitutional convention to decide whether the states 53-year old, 69-time amended constitution should be revised, let stand or replaced.

## RAILROAD LOANS

Congress March 30 sent to the President an amended bill (HR 1163) extending for 27 months, through June 30, 1963, the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans made to railroads by public or private lending institutions. The guarantee could cover loans for the purchase of capital equipment or for the maintenance of road, property and equipment. Final action came when the Senate and House adopted a conference report (H Rept 214) compromising on the length of extension of the law and striking out all other Senate amendments. The President signed the bill into law (PL 87-16) April 1.

The bill amended the Transportation Act of 1958 (PL 85-625), which authorized the ICC to guarantee up to \$500 million in loans through March 31, 1961. The insurance was limited to those loans which could not be obtained on reasonable terms without the guarantee. (1958 Almanac p. 244)

**BACKGROUND --** The House March 14, in passing HR 1163, extended the Act for 15 months. (Weekly Report p. 421)

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee March 28 reported the bill (S Rept 126) with amendments extending the Act for 36 months and the period for repayment of loans from the existing 15 years to 25 years. Amendments also: authorized the ICC to guarantee bonds issued by states or municipal agencies that wished to lease modern equipment and facilities to railroads engaged in commuter service; and brought the Railway Express Agency under the Act's loan provisions.

The report said the three-year extension was needed because the financial condition of some railroads, particularly in the East, was "just as critical as it was in 1958" when the program was started.

The provision for guaranteed state or municipal bonds, the Committee said, would encourage communities' "efforts to solve the commuter problem by acquiring equipment and facilities for lease to railroads" which suffer the "undue burden" of rendering commuter service.

The steady decline of Railway Express traffic and the obsolete and inefficient equipment owned by the company warranted making REA Express eligible for loan guarantees, the report said. As a "possible emergency measure for preserving the express business in private enterprise," the provision was in the public interest, the Committee said.

In separate views, Sens. A. S. Mike Monroney (D Okla.) and Clair Engle (D Calif.) said it was not "sound public policy" to guarantee express company loans "while similar arrangements are not available for the regulated trucking industry." The American Trucking Associations had expressed fears that REA intended to greatly enlarge its motor carrier activities, the report said. Sen. Ralph W. Yarborough (D Texas) also expressed disapproval of the REA amendment.

## FINAL ACTION

The Senate passed HR 1163 by voice vote March 29 after its floor manager, Sen. George A. Smathers (D Fla.), agreed to delete the committee amendment authorizing ICC guarantees for loans to the REA Express Company. Monroney, predicting that the REA would "become the world's largest trucking line," said that to guarantee loans to that company would "set a precedent for Government-guaranteed loans to all truck lines." Smathers and Andrew F. Schoepel (R Kan.) said the express company qualified as "an integral part of the railroad network" but in view of the March 31 expiration date for the entire loan program they did not want to hold up the bill. The remaining committee amendments were accepted.

The conference report on the bill (H Rept 214), adopted by both chambers March 30, called for a 27-month extension of the Act and rejected all other Senate amendments. "The House conferees felt that, without further study, those amendments would unduly broaden the scope of this legislation," Sen. Mike Mansfield (D Mont.) told the Senate.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1961

Congress March 30 completed action on an amended Third Supplemental appropriation bill (HR 5188) providing \$1,694,055,637 for fiscal 1961. The bill was cleared for the President after the House March 29 and the Senate March 30 approved the conference report (H Rept 211) by voice votes. The bill's total was \$3,645,509,490 less than budget estimates, \$890,549,518 more than House-approved funds, and \$2,943,364,333 less than the Senate had voted. (Weekly Report p. 385, 525)

The two largest items in the bill were \$500 million for temporary unemployment compensation advances to the states and \$402 million to meet the cost of pay increases voted for federal employees in 1960.

The largest amount eliminated from the Senate version by House-Senate conferees was an appropriation of \$2,820,307,000 to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the costs of farm price supports, surplus disposal, school milk and other programs. The appropriation had not been considered by the House. Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Carl Hayden (D Ariz.), floor manager of the bill, March 30 said House conferees insisted that the CCC had enough unobligated funds to "squeak" by until July 1, start of the new fiscal year, whereas Senate conferees wanted to restore the CCC "to good financial condition. "The only way we could get a conference report on this bill was for the Senate to recede" on the reimbursement items, Hayden said.

The conferees reduced to \$50 million the \$150 million appropriated by the Senate and requested by the Administration for the Development Loan Fund, and earmarked the \$50 million for use in the Western Hemisphere. The House originally had refused to grant any of the \$150 million requested by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball had testified Feb. 21 that the DLF's fiscal 1961

appropriation would be exhausted by the end of March and at that time the Fund would have before it \$400 million in proposed loans which could be approved before the start of fiscal 1962. DLF Managing Director Frank M. Coffin the same day had said the Fund was ready to approve loans totaling \$153 million to India for six projects, if Congress made the funds available.

The conference report also rejected a Senate recommendation that would have repealed a section of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of fiscal 1961. The repeal would have permitted payment of expenses for Members of Congress traveling between the District of Columbia and their home states on official committee trips, Hayden said.

House conferees agreed to the \$264.9 million appropriation proposed by the Senate for Defense Department personnel costs in lieu of the transfer of \$263.9 million from existing funds originally proposed by the House. Conferees also accepted Senate appropriations of \$350,000 for detailed plans to initiate construction of the Libby Dam in Montana, and \$600,000 through June 30 to enable each Member of the House of Representatives to hire an additional staff member or to raise the pay of his current staff.

The House agreed to Senate appropriations of \$1 million to enable the Public Health Service to establish a reserve of oral polio vaccine for use in the event of an epidemic, \$30 million for grants to the states for temporary aid to children of unemployed parents -- subject to enactment of HR 4884, the authorizing legislation -- and \$500 million for advances to the states provided by the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961.

**PROVISIONS -- As sent to the President, HR 5188 appropriated:**

Agriculture Department	
Forest Service	\$105,317,000
Commerce Department	
Foreign Commerce Bureau	225,000
Defense Department	
Military functions	264,900,000
Civil functions	350,000
Health, Education and Welfare	
Education Office	31,290,000
Public Health Service	1,000,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital	477,000
Social Security Administration	94,378,500
Office of the Secretary	230,000
Interior Department	
Land Management Bureau	4,696,000
Indian Affairs Bureau	4,549,000
National Park Service	3,034,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	2,013,000
Office of Territories	765,000
Justice Department	
Legal activities	275,000
Federal Prison System	2,350,000
Labor Department	
Employment Security Bureau	523,648,000
Employees' Compensation Bureau	1,133,500
Post Office Department	
Transportation	18,900,000
State Department	
Administration of foreign affairs	11,462,000
International organizations	100,000

Treasury Department	
Accounts Bureau	766,000
Secret Service	370,000
Bureau of the Mint	425,000
Independent Offices	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	7,650
Civil Aeronautics Board	17,500,000
Civil Service Commission	1,687,000
General Services Administration	21,600,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	49,000,000
Railroad Retirement Board	20,000,000
Veterans Administration	52,350,000
President's special international program	51,732,000
Judiciary	
Courts of Appeal, district courts	401,000
Legislative Branch	
Senate	189,660
House	740,000
Library of Congress	160,000
Executive Office	
Advisory Council on Labor-Management Policy	80,000
Miscellaneous agencies, pay costs	402,705,594
Claims and judgments	3,248,533
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,694,055,637</b>

**HOUSE DEBATE -- March 29 -- H.R. Gross (R Iowa) --** We find in this bill \$50 million for the Development Loan Fund, which simply means soft and uncollectable loans to South American countries to build more industries to ship more products to this country to cause more distressed areas. I do not like that."

Albert Thomas (D Texas), floor manager -- The \$50 million DLF appropriation "is a vast improvement over what we have been going through in the last 15 years.... It is a loan, it is not a gift."

**RELATED DEVELOPMENT --** Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.) April 3 said he was "afraid" that the final version of the bill left the Administration "with inadequate resources to do the work which Congress in previous action has directed the Executive Branch to do." He was particularly critical of the bill's failure to restore capital to the CCC and of the \$100 million cut in the request for the Development Loan Fund, which he said might lead to "serious difficulties" with friendly nations.

## PANAMA LINE

President Kennedy March 31 order Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr Jr. to discontinue the commercial operations of the Panama Line, effective April 20.

In ordering the Government-owned steamship line to confine itself to moving only Governmental passengers and cargo, the President in effect upheld a similar order issued by President Eisenhower Dec. 21, 1960. The Eisenhower order was to have taken effect Feb. 10, but President Kennedy Feb. 8 called for further study of the line's operations, permitting it to keep its commercial business until April 1. (Weekly Report p. 263)

Following four days of hearings Feb. 28-March 3 by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Panama Canal Subcommittee, Chairman Leonor Kretzer Sullivan (D Mo.) March 9 wrote the President, asking him to permit the Line to continue its operations, unchanged, at least until July 1.

## FULBRIGHT ACT

COMMITTEE -- Senate Foreign Relations.

BEGAN HEARINGS -- March 29 on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (S 1154) to consolidate and expand U.S. cultural and educational exchange programs. S 1154, introduced March 2 by Committee Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.), authorized the President to operate the unified program through an Under Secretary of State or new federal agency.

The bill consolidated every cultural and educational exchange program authorized by: the Fulbright Act (PL 79-584), the Smith-Mundt Act (PL 80-402), the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (PL 84-860), the Finnish Debt Payments Act of 1949 (PL 81-265), and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (PL 83-480).

As introduced, S 1154 eliminated the Fulbright Act provision that grants to foreign students coming to the United States could cover only transportation expenses. (The stipulation had been made when the program was established to use non-convertible foreign currencies earned from sale of surplus property.) The bill also omitted provisions in the Smith-Mundt Act which called for the expulsion of program participants who engaged in activities of a "detrimental" political nature, and for special security investigations of federal employees working under the act.

Other innovations in S 1154 included authorization of funds to finance the transportation to the U.S. of foreign performers and exhibits where the cost could not be met by the other government but the cultural value was high. The bill also provided that in certain cases the United States would pay the expenses of foreign teachers and students in U.S. institutions while other countries would meet the educational expenses of Americans abroad.

TESTIMONY -- March 29 -- Robert G. Storey, chairman of the Presidentially-appointed Board of Foreign Scholarships, supported S 1154 and said that since the circumstances under which the exchange programs had been conceived had been altered "it has become increasingly necessary to modify the provisions under which the programs operate and to coordinate the various programs."

American Assn. of University Women President Anna L. Rose Hawkes, Alton L. Denslow of the National Grange, and chairman of the federal Advisory Council on the Arts Sumner McKnight Crosby urged enactment of S 1154 as an important means of increasing international understanding.

Other organizations testifying in favor of S 1154: American Council on Education, Institute of International Education, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Social Science Research Council, International Schools Foundation, American Institute of Architects, Philadelphia Orchestra Assn., and National Education Assn. Former United States Information Agency Director (1957-61) George V. Allen and representatives of several universities also supported S 1154.

## PROGRAMS FOR THE AGED

COMMITTEE -- Senate Labor and Public Welfare.

ACTION -- March 28 issued a report (S Rept 128) submitted Jan. 27 by its Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and Aging, summarizing 1959-60 studies and recommending legislation. The Subcommittee, established in 1959, issued its report in February 1960, and expired Jan. 31. The Senate Feb. 13 approved creation of a non-legislative Special Committee on Aging (S Res 33) to continue the studies through Jan. 31, 1962. (Weekly Report p. 529; 1960 Almanac p. 165)

The report said: the approach to aging problems was "fragmented, piecemeal, haphazard and without focus"; financing of medical care for the aged had been "distorted into an emotional issue"; currently there were 16 million Americans aged 65 or over, with almost three-fifths of them having less than \$1,000 annual income, and "a new set of attitudes" would be needed to meet problems of the aged.

The report recommended, as a "first priority", legislation for a Social Security-financed health care program for the aged. It also proposed that the benefits be extended to all retired persons, regardless of whether they were covered by Social Security. The report said the cost of including them would be covered by appropriation from general revenues, with the net cost to the Government "relatively small since most of the funds will be offset by present Federal expenditures" for medical care programs. (Weekly Report p. 316)

The Subcommittee also proposed:

- Establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology for biological and social science research in aging.
- Inauguration of a federal-state program to stimulate and help finance citizen centers for the aged.
- Federal grants to the states for community mental health facilities, intensive treatment in mental hospitals, and more rapid communication and application of research knowledge.

The report recommended action on six bills introduced in 1960 to: require companies with Government contracts to eliminate all discrimination based on age; establish a senior citizens service training program; increase the minimum monthly Social Security benefit from \$33 to \$50; provide for issuance of Treasury bonds redeemable upon retirement at an amount adjusted to any cost of living increases subsequent to their purchase; provide improved housing for the elderly through increased federal contributions in public housing, direct loans to non-profit groups for low-rental housing construction, and inclusion of essential health and social services in multiple-housing programs; establish a U.S. Office of Aging to supervise programs for the aged.

Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.), in minority views, opposed establishing a National Institute of Gerontology and grants to states for senior citizen centers. He said the Institute would duplicate research already done by the National Institutes of Health, and the centers would create a "regimented and unhealthy atmosphere."

## SLIGHT DROP IN FEDERAL GRANTS BELIES UPWARD TREND

Federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments and to individuals fell off in fiscal 1960 for the first time since 1953, according to recently published data from the Treasury Department. But the decline from 1959, amounting to 4 percent, was largely attributable to short-term factors and reflected little change in the basic upward trend of most grant programs. Following are highlights of the 1960 data.

- Total grants amounted to \$9,175 million compared with \$9,590 million in fiscal 1959 -- a drop of \$415 million, contrasted with an increase of \$2,169 million or 29 percent from 1958 to 1959. The small 1960 decline, coupled with a large increase in Federal tax collections, served to reduce the ratio of grants to taxes from 12 percent to 10 percent. (See Table I, below)

- Grants to state and local governments, however, rose by 9 percent, from \$6,457 million to \$7,011 million, continuing a trend unbroken since fiscal 1953. Largest of the items accounting for the net increase of \$554 million in this category, comprising 64 separate programs, was an increase of \$328 million in highway grants.

- More than offsetting the increase in grants to state and local governments -- and accounting for the decline

in total grants -- was a 31 percent decrease in grants to individuals, from \$3,134 million to \$2,163 million. Making for the large decline in this category, comprising 32 separate programs, were sizable drops in three programs: \$450 million in payments under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation program of 1958; \$440 million in "soil bank" payments, with termination of the acreage reserve program; and \$193 million in veterans readjustment benefits, continuing a decline that began in fiscal 1957.

Further details concerning grants appear in the accompanying tables, as follows:

**Table I --** This shows the amounts spent from fiscal 1953 through fiscal 1960 for total grants, grants to state and local governments, and grants to individuals, together with the percentage increase or decrease for each category since the previous year and since 1953. Amounts listed as "Federal Tax Collections" are actually "Internal Revenue Collections" and do not include customs receipts and some other items. They do include social security payroll taxes, however, while social security benefit payments are not included in grants to individuals. Thus the ratio of grants to taxes shown is only a rough indicator of relationship in any single year; it does serve to point up the overall trend, however.

### Recent Trends in Grants-in-Aid\*

**Table I**

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
	Grants	Grants	Grants	Grants	Grants	Grants	Grants	Grants
Total Grants	\$ 4,054	\$ 4,284	\$ 4,595	\$ 5,152	\$ 6,468	\$ 7,421	\$ 9,590	\$ 9,175
To state, local govts. only	2,802	3,005	3,149	3,463	4,064	4,932	6,457	7,011
To individuals only	1,252	1,279	1,446	1,689	2,404	2,488	3,134	2,163
INCREASE OR DECREASE SINCE PRECEDING YEAR								
Total Grants	---	+ 6%	+ 7%	+ 12%	+ 25%	+ 15%	+ 29%	- 4%
To state, local govts. only	---	+ 7%	+ 5%	+ 10%	+ 17%	+ 21%	+ 31%	+ 9%
To individuals only	---	+ 2%	+ 13%	+ 17%	+ 42%	+ 3%	+ 26%	- 31%
INCREASE OR DECREASE FROM 1953								
Total Grants	---	+ 6%	+ 13%	+ 27%	+ 59%	+ 83%	+ 136%	+ 126%
To state, local govts. only	---	+ 7%	+ 12%	+ 24%	+ 45%	+ 76%	+ 130%	+ 150%
To individuals only	---	+ 2%	+ 15%	+ 35%	+ 92%	+ 99%	+ 150%	+ 73%
Federal Tax Collections	\$69,687	\$69,920	\$66,289	\$75,113	\$80,172	\$79,978	\$79,798	\$91,775
Portion of federal taxes returned to states as grants	6%	6%	7%	7%	8%	9%	12%	10%

\*Includes shared revenues and loans.

## State Allocations of U.S. Grants-in-Aid

Table III

Columns may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

	1960 Allocations	1960 Population	1960 Per Capita Allocations	1959 Allocations	1959 Est. Population	1959 Per Capita Allocations	1960 Share of Allocations	1960 Share of Federal Tax Burden*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ALABAMA	\$ 198,015,000	3,267,000	\$ 61	\$ 212,742,000	3,193,000	\$ 67	2.16%	1.03%
ALASKA	55,415,000	226,000	245	43,171,000	191,000	226	.60	.12
ARIZONA	84,117,000	1,302,000	65	88,152,000	1,233,000	71	.92	.57
ARKANSAS	120,247,000	1,786,000	67	138,618,000	1,744,000	79	1.31	.48
CALIFORNIA	677,584,000	15,717,000	43	750,521,000	14,639,000	51	7.38	10.48
COLORADO	136,436,000	1,754,000	78	136,610,000	1,682,000	81	1.49	.92
CONNECTICUT	89,835,000	2,535,000	35	87,002,000	2,415,000	36	.98	2.11
DELAWARE	20,485,000	446,000	46	22,237,000	454,000	49	.22	.55
D. OF C.	81,215,000	764,000	106	85,183,000	840,000	101	.88	.69
FLORIDA	211,673,000	4,952,000	43	181,484,000	4,761,000	38	2.31	2.46
GEORGIA	229,794,000	3,943,000	58	233,323,000	3,838,000	61	2.50	1.37
HAWAII	41,343,000	633,000	65	36,444,000	656,000	56	.45	.30
IDAHO	61,877,000	667,000	93	59,981,000	664,000	90	.67	.27
ILLINOIS	437,789,000	10,081,000	43	373,819,000	10,205,000	37	4.77	7.08
INDIANA	171,386,000	4,662,000	37	187,011,000	4,638,000	40	1.87	2.38
IOWA	155,534,000	2,758,000	56	180,369,000	2,809,000	64	1.69	1.19
KANSAS	140,370,000	2,179,000	64	153,709,000	2,140,000	72	1.53	1.02
KENTUCKY	180,437,000	3,038,000	59	168,194,000	3,125,000	54	1.97	1.12
LOUISIANA	251,931,000	3,257,000	77	256,709,000	3,166,000	81	2.75	1.23
MAINE	56,291,000	969,000	58	52,236,000	949,000	55	.61	.44
MARYLAND	106,483,000	3,101,000	34	127,845,000	3,031,000	42	1.16	1.90
MASSACHUSETTS	244,748,000	5,149,000	48	252,388,000	4,951,000	51	2.67	3.40
MICHIGAN	277,771,000	7,823,000	35	354,745,000	7,960,000	45	3.03	4.66
MINNESOTA	195,627,000	3,414,000	57	213,255,000	3,399,000	63	2.13	1.68
MISSISSIPPI	137,717,000	2,178,000	63	173,115,000	2,185,000	79	1.50	.50
MISSOURI	260,983,000	4,320,000	60	296,615,000	4,243,000	70	2.84	2.34
MONTANA	68,692,000	675,000	102	63,388,000	687,000	100	.75	.32
NEBRASKA	83,099,000	1,411,000	59	97,388,000	1,456,000	67	.91	.64
NEVADA	23,108,000	285,000	81	31,693,000	280,000	113	.25	.20
NEW HAMPSHIRE	40,227,000	607,000	66	32,023,000	592,000	54	.44	.32
NEW JERSEY	158,422,000	6,067,000	26	172,747,000	5,930,000	29	1.73	4.20
NEW MEXICO	86,658,000	951,000	91	101,045,000	879,000	115	.94	.39
NEW YORK	655,889,000	16,782,000	39	671,657,000	16,945,000	41	7.15	13.22
NORTH CAROLINA	198,783,000	4,556,000	44	209,958,000	4,530,000	46	2.17	1.46
NORTH DAKOTA	86,252,000	632,000	138	77,206,000	642,000	120	.94	.23
OHIO	371,172,000	9,706,000	38	406,754,000	9,700,000	42	4.04	5.82
OKLAHOMA	189,735,000	2,328,000	81	233,467,000	2,276,000	103	2.07	1.02
OREGON	136,340,000	1,769,000	77	117,490,000	1,766,000	67	1.49	.89
PENNSYLVANIA	399,721,000	11,319,000	35	489,158,000	11,323,000	43	4.36	7.08
RHODE ISLAND	42,601,000	859,000	50	45,083,000	875,000	52	.46	.52
SOUTH CAROLINA	120,483,000	2,383,000	51	129,994,000	2,417,000	54	1.31	.64
SOUTH DAKOTA	74,669,000	680,000	110	69,957,000	687,000	102	.81	.23
TENNESSEE	203,004,000	3,567,000	57	197,141,000	3,501,000	56	2.21	1.20
TEXAS	534,352,000	9,580,000	56	521,135,000	9,513,000	55	5.82	4.43
UTAH	77,740,000	891,000	87	69,691,000	880,000	79	.85	.38
VERMONT	33,534,000	390,000	86	24,939,000	372,000	67	.37	.18
VIRGINIA	151,000,000	3,967,000	38	144,890,000	3,992,000	36	1.65	1.75
WASHINGTON	158,827,000	2,853,000	56	178,278,000	2,823,000	63	1.73	1.57
WEST VIRGINIA	113,740,000	1,860,000	61	105,061,000	1,965,000	53	1.24	.77
WISCONSIN	161,824,000	3,952,000	41	156,217,000	4,010,000	39	1.76	2.07
WYOMING	57,342,000	330,000	174	58,432,000	319,000	183	.62	.18
TERRITORIES	126,123,000			122,927,000				
UNDISTRIBUTED	196,186,000			192,171,000				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$9,174,632,000</b>	<b>179,323,000</b>	<b>\$ 51</b>	<b>\$9,590,370,000</b>	<b>177,021,000</b>	<b>\$ 54</b>	<b>100.0 %</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*Computed by Tax Foundation, Inc.

SOURCE: TREASURY DEPARTMENT, CENSUS BUREAU

**Table II** -- This shows the relative "benefit-to-burden" standing of the 50 states, determined by dividing each state's share of total grants paid in 1960 by its share of total Federal tax payments. (Both of these figures appear also in Table III.) Because actual tax collections in each state do not accurately reflect the true incidence of taxation (auto, liquor, and tobacco excise collections, for example, are credited to the home states of manufacturers although the taxes are in turn paid by every purchaser of these products), CQ used "tax-burden" figures prepared by Tax Foundation, Inc. based on a special allocation formula as applied to estimated 1960 revenues. States were then ranked in order of their "benefit-to-burden" ratio, ranging from Alaska, whose relative share of grants was five times as much as its relative share of taxes, to Delaware, where the relative share of grants was only 0.40 percent of its relative share of taxes.

**Table III** -- This shows, for each state, total grants, population, and per capita share of grants for fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1959, as well as percentage shares of total 1960 grants and the Federal tax burden, as described above. Grants averaged \$51 per capita, based on the April 1, 1960 census, and ranged from \$245 per capita in Alaska to \$26 per capita in New Jersey. Per capita figures for 1959 are misleading in some cases, since the 1959 population estimates proved to have been too high in some instances. There is a rough correlation, it will be noted, between a state's per capita share of grants and its "benefits-to-burden" standing in Table II. (Reasons for the wide variation in these figures are discussed below.)

**Table IV** -- This shows each state's allocations under the nine largest grant programs of 1960, which together accounted for 72 percent of all grant funds. (Three programs alone-- highways, old-age assistance, and aid to dependent children -- took 52 percent of the \$9.2 billion total.) The next eleven programs, ranging from \$170 million for aid to the disabled to \$72 million for sugar subsidies, accounted for an additional 14 percent of the total. Allocations under the nine largest programs suggest the extent to which grants vary. For example, the five states receiving the largest amounts for highways were New York, Illinois, Texas, California, and Ohio, in that order. Largest grants for old-age assistance went to California, Texas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma, while the top five recipients of soil bank payments were Texas, North Dakota, Minnesota, Kansas, and South Dakota. Only Texas appears in all three groups, only California in two of the three.

## Background

Many factors help to account for the uneven distribution of grants-in-aid, both within programs and as between programs. Allocation formulas vary from one program to the next; some, like the public assistance programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are "intended to provide the highest percentages of Federal participation to the low-income states, which generally have relatively large proportions of needy people and make relatively low assistance payments," according to HEW. Such programs redistribute income, in effect, from high-income to low-income states.

## How States Rank

Table II

The redistributive effect of Federal grants is shown by dividing each state's share of total grants (Column 1) by its share of the 1960 Federal tax burden (Column 2), yielding a "benefit-to-burden" ratio or index (Column 3) according to which 34 states (and the District of Columbia) received relatively more in grants than they paid in taxes, while 16 states received relatively less. States are ranked according to this index.

Rank	State	1	2	3
1.	Alaska	0.60%	0.12%	5.00
2.	North Dakota	0.94	0.23	4.09
3.	South Dakota	0.81	0.23	3.52
4.	Wyoming	0.62	0.18	3.44
5.	Mississippi	1.50	0.50	3.00
6.	Arkansas	1.31	0.48	2.75
7.	Idaho	0.67	0.27	2.48
8.	New Mexico	0.94	0.39	2.41
9.	Montana	0.75	0.32	2.34
10.	Louisiana	2.75	1.23	2.24
11.	Utah	0.85	0.38	2.24
12.	Alabama	2.16	1.03	2.10
13.	Vermont	0.37	0.18	2.06
14.	South Carolina	1.31	0.64	2.05
15.	Oklahoma	2.07	1.02	2.03
16.	Tennessee	2.21	1.20	1.84
17.	Georgia	2.50	1.37	1.83
18.	Kentucky	1.97	1.12	1.76
19.	Oregon	1.49	0.89	1.67
20.	Colorado	1.49	0.92	1.62
21.	Arizona	0.92	0.57	1.61
22.	West Virginia	1.24	0.77	1.61
23.	Hawaii	0.45	0.30	1.50
24.	Kansas	1.53	1.02	1.50
25.	North Carolina	2.17	1.46	1.49
26.	Iowa	1.69	1.19	1.42
27.	Nebraska	0.91	0.64	1.42
28.	Maine	0.61	0.44	1.39
29.	New Hampshire	0.44	0.32	1.38
30.	Texas	5.82	4.43	1.31
31.	District of Columbia	0.88	0.69	1.28
32.	Minnesota	2.13	1.68	1.27
33.	Nevada	0.25	0.20	1.25
34.	Missouri	2.84	2.34	1.21
35.	Washington	1.73	1.57	1.10
36.	Florida	2.31	2.46	0.94
37.	Virginia	1.65	1.75	0.94
38.	Rhode Island	0.46	0.52	0.89
39.	Wisconsin	1.76	2.07	0.85
40.	Indiana	1.87	2.38	0.79
41.	Massachusetts	2.67	3.40	0.79
42.	California	7.38	10.48	0.70
43.	Ohio	4.04	5.82	0.69
44.	Illinois	4.77	7.08	0.67
45.	Michigan	3.03	4.66	0.65
46.	Pennsylvania	4.36	7.08	0.62
47.	Maryland	1.16	1.90	0.61
48.	New York	7.15	13.22	0.54
49.	Connecticut	0.98	2.11	0.46
50.	New Jersey	1.73	4.20	0.41
51.	Delaware	0.22	0.55	0.40

## Grants-in-Aid: Nine Largest Programs

Table IV

(Fiscal 1960)

	Highways	Old-Age Assistance	Aid to Dependent Children	Army National Guard	Readjustment Benefits	Unemployment Compensation	Soil Bank Payments	Air Force National Guard	Agricultural Conservation
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Ala.</b>	\$ 50,911,357	\$ 48,374,560	\$ 8,299,942	\$ 11,385,621	\$ 12,224,156	\$ 4,140,330	\$ 5,021,029	\$ 2,480,315	\$ 4,952,542
<b>Alaska</b>	14,551,447	747,241	1,065,331	2,530,521	125,098	1,328,500	-----	744,161	62,958
<b>Ariz.</b>	29,380,289	7,652,167	7,907,227	1,984,753	3,349,030	3,661,664	102,528	2,847,175	2,798,081
<b>Ark.</b>	31,163,923	25,525,273	4,223,561	6,254,603	4,272,032	3,029,569	6,083,237	1,787,827	5,444,887
<b>Calif.</b>	168,504,363	136,760,767	73,952,844	17,635,618	40,235,327	32,036,628	2,543,657	6,279,898	5,415,843
<b>Colo.</b>	33,598,701	25,369,150	7,476,886	2,316,905	5,933,842	2,982,219	10,535,330	2,501,430	3,204,360
<b>Conn.</b>	28,682,824	7,711,404	6,599,854	4,637,540	3,966,325	4,756,905	72,994	1,636,240	449,469
<b>Del.</b>	8,248,452	575,239	1,304,936	2,600,459	377,543	757,989	354,228	1,018,290	317,405
<b>D. C.</b>	16,125,267	1,665,793	5,342,656	1,465,619	7,107,004	2,356,419	-----	1,808,641	-----
<b>Fla.</b>	74,043,163	36,593,518	18,238,962	4,946,496	12,924,296	5,895,230	1,987,009	1,231,359	2,707,482
<b>Ga.</b>	60,440,440	42,328,604	12,799,964	8,533,540	13,390,496	4,177,528	11,736,395	3,696,753	7,410,941
<b>Hawaii</b>	4,321,376	677,074	2,581,445	5,092,543	1,032,099	988,016	-----	2,847,991	167,016
<b>Idaho</b>	22,095,964	4,078,349	2,097,833	3,378,447	1,564,140	1,975,125	2,874,615	1,465,423	1,815,549
<b>Ill.</b>	199,991,459	39,740,107	38,783,673	9,819,854	15,499,083	13,670,135	7,406,899	3,135,386	8,258,633
<b>Ind.</b>	74,440,250	13,553,578	10,277,185	7,236,330	7,706,890	4,841,862	7,754,573	2,281,557	6,136,992
<b>Iowa</b>	67,694,866	19,519,363	9,077,374	5,145,021	6,695,422	2,787,225	9,199,735	2,467,026	5,636,546
<b>Kan.</b>	51,288,446	16,186,865	6,240,237	5,132,438	3,456,313	2,294,688	18,190,175	1,863,045	6,549,992
<b>Ky.</b>	65,970,074	25,526,466	16,603,125	3,883,491	5,815,487	3,534,947	7,419,151	1,293,661	7,632,430
<b>La.</b>	69,592,608	72,541,960	22,498,101	5,708,325	9,474,792	3,856,450	2,500,328	1,218,286	4,981,706
<b>Maine</b>	19,928,624	7,175,425	5,585,711	3,407,496	1,430,104	1,478,764	1,239,496	1,338,234	1,017,887
<b>Md.</b>	27,277,041	4,723,464	9,762,246	7,233,328	3,462,903	5,420,870	1,282,952	1,738,172	1,393,125
<b>Mass.</b>	66,795,208	41,484,172	13,544,138	11,277,289	10,970,475	11,529,307	42,918	3,016,853	544,880
<b>Mich.</b>	95,978,454	32,400,600	23,852,459	9,775,900	13,615,390	14,870,434	7,304,187	3,383,506	4,028,679
<b>Minn.</b>	64,364,669	25,668,457	9,458,124	7,664,363	8,214,603	4,463,586	20,440,524	2,698,893	5,684,680
<b>Miss.</b>	36,142,975	24,328,167	8,444,953	8,284,690	4,489,423	3,093,025	4,438,183	1,866,513	7,477,938
<b>Mo.</b>	75,962,689	57,394,921	21,980,050	6,285,054	10,172,185	5,323,207	12,645,168	2,764,741	8,901,126
<b>Mont.</b>	29,345,613	3,659,374	1,878,344	2,590,762	1,558,291	1,590,723	4,716,535	1,472,846	3,075,404
<b>Neb.</b>	27,092,594	9,348,099	3,112,700	3,207,071	3,591,479	1,409,681	9,381,218	1,076,475	5,424,395
<b>Nev.</b>	9,549,557	1,393,502	943,008	1,063,222	317,537	1,217,992	-----	1,140,327	354,336
<b>N. H.</b>	19,473,272	2,824,125	1,178,179	2,588,087	1,138,040	1,200,604	159,089	1,080,414	537,743
<b>N. J.</b>	53,083,050	9,414,925	11,752,935	12,153,053	7,602,191	11,933,708	785,722	2,898,200	719,350
<b>N. M.</b>	23,857,879	6,353,068	8,090,520	3,365,821	1,671,559	1,937,731	7,409,674	1,131,822	1,828,524
<b>N. Y.</b>	216,956,224	46,732,734	73,651,974	21,295,923	25,878,014	53,390,873	5,284,081	6,248,803	5,129,843
<b>N. C.</b>	59,325,942	19,234,897	21,139,409	7,440,781	8,821,163	5,333,956	3,442,176	1,131,075	6,717,652
<b>N. D.</b>	32,661,124	4,235,686	1,940,307	2,256,936	2,670,285	1,089,621	22,840,487	1,335,971	4,612,717
<b>Ohio</b>	158,815,030	47,740,796	26,882,048	10,673,471	12,757,523	13,633,501	6,621,924	4,955,850	6,277,335
<b>Okla.</b>	33,134,833	51,773,476	16,784,169	5,215,443	7,468,697	3,638,433	14,201,265	2,433,394	6,499,065
<b>Ore.</b>	49,833,244	9,228,794	5,507,772	4,587,442	2,055,918	3,779,602	2,983,191	1,600,109	2,333,251
<b>Pa.</b>	116,461,815	25,595,576	49,317,066	14,039,582	22,459,624	22,919,419	4,068,380	4,159,404	5,186,880
<b>R. I.</b>	12,490,727	3,597,790	4,237,241	2,507,415	1,926,474	2,703,200	1,141	1,009,498	86,464
<b>S. C.</b>	46,691,877	12,116,668	5,428,743	6,833,574	6,348,911	3,037,657	7,197,166	1,210,855	3,836,033
<b>S. D.</b>	25,748,650	4,806,177	3,009,619	3,036,516	2,716,287	835,191	15,275,441	1,315,793	5,070,664
<b>Tenn.</b>	66,749,871	22,212,977	15,435,046	9,417,251	8,109,401	3,858,338	6,664,914	3,232,169	5,811,843
<b>Texas</b>	197,593,219	103,187,202	15,571,733	14,403,371	22,518,776	12,380,673	26,858,499	4,113,703	22,005,096
<b>Utah</b>	32,354,005	4,405,261	3,588,911	3,662,545	3,749,318	2,356,390	1,965,576	1,820,255	1,302,785
<b>Vt.</b>	16,530,635	2,909,809	1,267,626	2,678,020	662,110	943,956	436,021	1,030,919	917,505
<b>Va.</b>	53,220,156	6,012,336	7,657,169	7,711,085	4,577,123	2,774,306	1,443,306	902,834	4,825,530
<b>Wash.</b>	41,910,120	25,819,741	9,841,302	6,526,932	9,026,954	5,870,204	3,952,530	1,871,716	2,663,754
<b>W. Va.</b>	46,752,211	6,918,465	17,924,842	4,246,542	4,070,934	2,175,281	643,154	1,722,602	1,729,905
<b>Wis.</b>	61,264,499	18,810,928	8,672,547	7,684,592	7,427,629	4,424,385	7,579,682	3,201,327	5,122,274
<b>Wyo.</b>	25,144,051	1,766,304	747,527	1,859,269	671,884	893,566	964,283	1,179,754	2,184,945
<b>P. R.</b>	7,324,539	2,031,936	5,088,832	5,114,038	10,614,995	1,155,877	-----	1,403,269	910,607
<b>V. I.</b>	-----	74,812	62,942	-----	-----	89,146	-----	-----	-----
<b>TERRITORIES<sup>1</sup></b>	-----	13,520	53,382	-----	-----	21,936	-----	-----	-----
<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>	8,110,784	-----	-----	70,625,247	-----	5,309,093	-----	110,426,688	-----
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$2,912,748,880	\$1,170,521,662	\$668,764,710	\$400,400,235	\$387,915,575	\$317,155,668	\$306,050,766	\$224,517,448	\$208,155,247

<sup>1</sup>Includes American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific.

SOURCE: TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Other programs, like readjustment benefits paid to veterans, result in allocations that vary largely according to population. Another type of program tends to benefit some states much more than others because of the less-than-national character of the need to be met. This is true of payments to farmers under the conservation reserve section of the "soil bank" program, heavily concentrated in the farm belt; of jobless benefits paid under the temporary extension program of 1958 (only 17 states participated); and of urban renewal and public housing payments, concentrated in the more urban states.

Following are the formulas governing allocation of funds under certain typical grant programs.

● **HIGHWAYS** -- Two formulas apply. Funds for primary, secondary, and urban roads (the so-called ABC system), are distributed as follows: one-third in the ratio of a state's area to total U.S. area; one-third in the ratio of a state's rural population to total U.S. rural population in 1940; and one-third in the ratio of a state's rural delivery and star route mileage to total such mileage in the U.S. Funds for the interstate system were distributed for fiscal 1957-59 as follows: one-half according to population and one-half according to the foregoing formula for ABC roads. This was then revised to conform with new estimates of the cost to complete the system. States must match Federal grants for ABC roads, dollar for dollar, but 90 percent of the cost of the interstate system is met with Federal funds.

● **OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE** -- Federal funds equal four-fifths of the first \$30 of a maximum average monthly payment of \$65 per recipient plus a percentage of the next \$35 of such average payment, which varies according to the average per capita income in the state for the most recent three years; except that the Federal share of payments in any state shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 65 percent. Unlike the highway programs, in which total Federal grants are limited by Congressional authorization, old-age assistance is an "open-end" program in which total Federal grants are limited only by the "load" of persons qualifying for assistance under the various state programs.

● **HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION** -- Under the Hill-Burton Act of 1946, Federal grants for construction of hospitals and medical facilities are allotted to the states in the ratio which the population of each state, weighted by the square of its allotment percentage, bears to the sum of the corresponding products of weighted populations for all of the states. The allotment percentage is tied to a state's per capita income. Total Federal grants are limited by appropriations (\$185 million in fiscal 1961); matching requirements vary according to a state's fiscal ability, ranging from one-third to two-thirds of project costs.

● **POLLUTION CONTROL** -- Grants for the construction of waste treatment facilities, limited to a maximum of 30 percent of cost or \$250,000 for any single project, are allotted to the states as follows: one-half according to population, and one-half according to per capita income. Total grants under the program are limited to the amount of the authorization -- \$50 million per year. (President Eisenhower vetoed a bill in 1960 raising the annual authorization to \$90 million.)

● **SCHOOL AID** -- Grants to build and operate schools have been paid since 1950 to school districts overburdened by Federal activities in their areas. Neither of the two laws governing the program requires allocation of funds by state or local matching; total grants are limited only by the extent of demand. Payments are related to per-pupil costs in the areas affected and vary with the category of children involved, being higher for those whose parents both work and live on Federal property than for those whose parents either work or live on Federal property.

● **AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION** -- Federal grants to pay one-half the cost of building airports were authorized in 1946; a two-year extension enacted in 1959 authorized total grants of \$63 million per year, of which \$45 million is allocated to the states according to their area and population, and \$15 million at the discretion of the Federal Aviation Agency.

## Outlook

The small decline in total grants in fiscal 1960 promises to be short-lived; projections accompanying President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal 1962 show grants to state and local governments alone rising to \$7.5 billion in fiscal 1961 and to \$7.9 billion in fiscal 1962. Neither figure reflects President Kennedy's proposals for new or expanded grant programs.

In his budget message of March 24, for example, President Kennedy estimated the following increases over the January budget for grant programs: \$500 million for general public school assistance; \$440 million for temporary jobless benefits; \$215 million for aid to dependent children of the unemployed; \$100 million for surplus food distribution. The total for these four programs -- \$1,255 million -- was more than one-half of the \$2,322 million increase proposed in all non-defense expenditures.

President Eisenhower fought a long and losing battle with Congress in his effort to scale back various grant programs, either by reducing the total Federal commitment (as in the airport construction program) or by modifying matching formulas to increase the state and local share of the burden (as in the urban renewal program). His plan to turn over the water pollution control program to the states, along with a portion of the Federal tax on local telephone service, came to nought. (Mr. Eisenhower was also responsible, however, for initiating the interstate highway program, now the largest single grant program.)

So far, President Kennedy has taken no stand on the general issue of grants-in-aid. He has proposed a cut-back in aid to "impacted" school districts, but only because he is backing a general aid-to-schools program. Taken together, his various proposals add up to a strong endorsement for new or expanded forms of Federal grants to state and local governments and to individuals. Given the probable support of Congress for most of these proposals, there is a good prospect that total grants will pass the \$10 billion mark in the current fiscal year or shortly thereafter.

## PRE-INAUGURAL TASK FORCES UNPRECEDENTED IN HISTORY

John F. Kennedy made an important innovation in American Presidential transitions through his appointment of 29 task forces which were asked to report to him on a wide variety of domestic and foreign policy problems in the period immediately preceding and following his inauguration.

A review of past Presidential transition periods shows that while other Presidents-elect sometimes asked individual political associates or small groups of experts to brief them on limited phases of public policy, there is no precedent for the large number of task forces, some with wide memberships, which submitted detailed policy briefings to Kennedy near the time of his inauguration.\*

This Congressional Quarterly Fact Sheet reports on the role which the task forces played during the Eisenhower-Kennedy transition and in the opening period of the new Administration, lists all pre-inaugural task forces together with their chairmen and other members who later received Kennedy Administration appointments, and reviews the continuing appointment of new task forces in the post-inaugural period.

### Task Force Idea Develops

The idea of task force reports on a wide range of policy problems appears to have evolved gradually during the weeks following Mr. Kennedy's nomination at the Democratic National Convention in July, rather than springing full-blown into being in the mind of either Mr. Kennedy or one of his advisors. Political circumstances, combined with Sen. Kennedy's own knowledge of the early, crucial policy decisions he would face if elected, were chiefly responsible for the appointment of the first task forces.

Perhaps significantly, the heads of the first task forces appointed were two of Mr. Kennedy's erstwhile rivals for the Democratic Presidential nomination -- Adlai E. Stevenson and Sen. Stuart Symington (D Mo.). Their assignment to specific tasks gave Mr. Kennedy a way he might put their talents to use and demonstrate their support for his candidacy.

Meeting with Mr. Kennedy July 29 in Hyannis Port, Stevenson suggested that Mr. Kennedy request the preparation of a foreign policy report for submission to him as soon as possible after election day, presuming he were elected. Stevenson suggested the report be a concise and readable document reviewing foreign policy areas which should have the priority attention of the President-elect, together with suggestions for new directions in U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Kennedy responded favorably to the suggestion and asked Stevenson to undertake the project.

A week later Mr. Kennedy asked Symington to prepare the national defense organization report, and Aug. 31 he announced the appointment of Paul H. Nitze to prepare a report on national security policy for use in the transition period. The Nitze task force was the first with which no leading politician was associated. It was the only report submitted before election day, and was not released.

In all, Mr. Kennedy appointed seven task forces before election day. Three concerned foreign policy and national defense, one dealt with natural resources, two with domestic agriculture and one with the overseas food program. The only political usefulness of these task forces to Mr. Kennedy -- in addition to using the talents of former rivals for the nomination, -- was to show his awareness of and interest in general policy fields.

### Following the Election

In the days immediately following his election, President-elect Kennedy began to draw up a detailed list of proposed task forces in both the foreign and domestic policy fields. By this point the task force idea appears to have taken definite form in his mind. One factor encouraging him to appoint a full group may have been the definite recommendation for a group of such reports on foreign policy, contained in the Stevenson report he received Nov. 14.

With the assistance of Theodore C. Sorensen, Counsel-designate to the President, Mr. Kennedy made a final decision on which task forces to appoint, and their membership, during the latter part of November. Most of the foreign policy task force reports were "farmed out" to the Ball-Sharon group (see below). The task forces on domestic policy, plus India and America, were appointed directly by Mr. Kennedy. During the early days of December personal telephone calls were made to the proposed members, in some instances by Mr. Kennedy himself or Kennedy staff member Myer Feldman, but usually by Sorensen. In each case a deadline was given for submission of the task force report. There was no regular communication between the Kennedy office and the task force chairmen or membership between appointment and the time the final report was submitted. The bulk of necessary staff work in setting up the task forces was left to Sorensen, who had some assistance from Feldman.

All of the task forces, together with notation of the days they were appointed and the days of their reports, are listed on p. 3, below.

### Ball-Sharon Project

The Stevenson task force report on foreign policy, which Mr. Kennedy had requested July 29, was submitted Nov. 14 and became the first major report the President-elect received following his election. Assisting Stevenson in preparation of the report had been Washington lawyers

\*For background on past Presidential transitions, see Editorial Research Reports, "Transfer of Executive Power," Nov. 23, 1960; and Laurin L. Henry, "Presidential Transition," Brookings Institution, 1960.

George W. Ball, subsequently appointed Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and John Sharon, a law partner of Ball's and aide to Stevenson in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns. They, in turn, had enlisted the aid of 15 to 20 consultants from academic communities, private business and foundations. None of them was a participant in the campaign.

The Stevenson report was divided into two parts, one listing all necessary or advisable foreign policy decisions and actions by the President-elect prior to his inauguration, and a second outlining major foreign policy areas for action following inauguration. The report recommended that Mr. Kennedy appoint a group of separate task forces on specific foreign policy areas and subjects, to take a cold, hard look at pressing questions, assemble specific data, and make specific recommendations for Presidential consideration. When he received the Stevenson report from Sharon Nov. 14, Mr. Kennedy was noncommittal on the suggestion of additional foreign policy task force reports. He contacted Ball and Sharon Nov. 24, however, asking them to go ahead with a specific group of foreign policy task forces. (See listing, p. 3, below).

Mr. Kennedy said he wanted each report to include precise recommendations, and he set Dec. 31 as a deadline for submission. Ball and Sharon Dec. 2 conferred with Mr. Kennedy, discussing subject matter of the task forces and hearing Mr. Kennedy's recommendations for task force personnel. Following the Dec. 2 meeting, Ball and Sharon submitted periodic reports and maintained regular liaison with Sorensen. They were assisted on a full-time basis by J. Robert Schaetzel, on leave from the office of the Secretary of State, and Thomas D. Finney Jr., administrative assistant to Sen. A.S. Mike Monroney (D Okla.). An expert on the field covered by each task force was assigned to act as its secretary, and he was able to draw on the thoughts contained in papers submitted by numerous consultants (about 100 for all the Ball-Sharon task forces combined).

Working seven days a week until midnight -- including Christmas and New Year's, -- the Ball-Sharon group edited a total of six detailed task force reports. Their report on the balance-of-payments problem was prepared on a priority basis and submitted Dec. 27. It reportedly aided the Kennedy Administration in negotiations with the German Government on possible German action to help the U.S. stem its gold outflow, and also formed an important part of the President's Feb. 6 message to Congress on the balance-of-payments problem.

By the day of his inauguration, President Kennedy had appointed 29 task forces. Of these, 24 had already reported to him. The 29 task forces appointed were almost evenly divided between foreign and domestic policy. An average of about one person for each task force was to be appointed to an important policy-making post within the new Administration within the coming weeks.

None of the task force members was compensated in any way for his services. The Ball-Sharon project incurred administrative expenses of approximately \$20,000, which was paid for by a foundation grant. President-elect Kennedy and his staff incurred administrative expenses of \$350,000 between election day and inauguration, which were paid for by the Democratic National Committee. There is no breakdown on what portion of those expenses might be attributed to task force projects.

## Assessment

In the eyes of the men intimately associated with them, the task forces have the following major advantages:

1. They furnish the new President with a precise definition of the major policy decisions which he must make -- before and immediately following his inauguration. They give him the opportunity to carefully appraise most problems before he must make decisions on them.

2. They help the President to establish a sense of priority among the various fields in which the new Administration might take action, helping him to make the decisions on which things are most important, which may be delayed, and the like. Thus they provide the President-elect, his Budget Director and his Counsel with a framework within which future policy may be considered.

3. They give the new President a vehicle by which he can tap the thinking of the best brains of the U.S., obtaining fresh, non-governmental thinking not weighted down by parochial departmental interests. The President-elect is given an opportunity to obtain this information, in areas where deemed advisable, on a confidential basis. He is not in any way committed to follow the advice furnished in task force reports. In many cases, various task forces have reflected clearly conflicting points of view, or strong dissenting opinions have been presented within the confines of a single task force report.

4. The task forces may, in recommending controversial policies, act as a "trial balloon" for policies the new Administration is thinking of endorsing. Or a task force report may simply serve as a public relations device to arouse popular support for a policy to which the President-elect is already firmly committed.

5. Task force members may constitute a type of skeleton staff to which the President-elect may turn when need arises during the transition period. On Dec. 2, for instance, President-elect Kennedy asked Ball and Sharon to furnish him specific information on three specific subjects he expected to be discussed at his Jan. 6 meeting with President Eisenhower. He then left Washington for several days, asking not to be disturbed. Later Dec. 2, Clark Clifford, who was in charge of transition period relations with the outgoing Administration, was told of other policy areas Mr. Eisenhower wished to discuss Dec. 6. He informed Sharon and Ball, who were able to draw up briefing papers on eight policy fields to furnish to Mr. Kennedy before his interview with the President. In addition, Mr. Kennedy was able to confer with Mr. Nitze the night before his interview. Such extensive background briefing is rarely available to a President before his inauguration.

6. Through the task force mechanism, the President-elect may tap the talents of hundreds of talented individuals who might otherwise never come to his attention. From the ranks of task force members recruited from the academic communities, business, the professions and foundations, he may find many persons whom he wishes to appoint to positions of importance within his Administration. But before appointing them, he has a chance to see them at work, to see how they react under the pressure of short deadlines for task force reports, and how well they can work with others.

7. Through their task force work, the members selected for Administration positions may increase their own knowledge and effectiveness for their new jobs. In some cases, appointees of the new Administration may serve on several task forces in different but related fields.

Through this experience they are able to help integrate the recommendations in the task force reports. Later, in office, they are more familiar with problems of other departments.

## Pre-Inaugural Task Forces

Listed below, in order of their appointment, are the task forces appointed by President-elect John F. Kennedy prior to his inauguration. In some instances the actual date of the request or submission of a task force report may be a day or two earlier than that given because of a delay in release to the press. Only the names of task force secretaries or chairmen, plus task force members who have received subsequent Kennedy Administration appointments, are given.

**FOREIGN POLICY** -- Requested July 29; submitted Nov. 14; not released; divided into two parts, one summarizing necessary foreign policy decisions and actions of the President-elect prior to his inauguration, and a second summarizing post-inauguration foreign policy problems. A report containing supplementary information requested by the President-elect was submitted Nov. 24. Chairman Adlai E. Stevenson (U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations); chief assistants Washington lawyers George W. Ball (Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs) and John Sharon.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT** -- Requested Aug. 6; submitted Dec. 5; released (1960 Weekly Report p. 1952). Chairman Sen. Stuart Symington (D Mo.); members included former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter (U.S. Ambassador to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and Roswell L. Gilpatrick (Deputy Secretary of Defense).

**NATIONAL SECURITY** -- Requested Aug. 31; submitted Nov. 5; not released. Chairman Paul H. Nitze (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs); members included Gilpatrick (see National Defense, above).

**NATURAL RESOURCES** -- Requested during September; submitted Jan. 17; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 73). Prepared by the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee, of which Rep. Frank E. Smith (D Miss.) was chairman.

**WHEAT** -- Requested in late October; submitted Jan. 31; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 176). Chairman John Schmittker of Kansas State University.

**COTTON** -- Requested in late October; submitted Jan. 31; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 177). Chairman Alexander Nunn, executive editor, Progressive Farmer, Birmingham, Ala.

**OVERSEAS FOOD PROGRAM** -- Requested Oct. 31; submitted Jan. 19; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 120). Chairman Murray D. Lincoln, president of CARE.

**REGULATORY AGENCIES** -- Requested Nov. 18; submitted Dec. 21; released (1960 Weekly Report p. 2019). Prepared by James M. Landis, former dean of Harvard Law School and member of several regulatory agencies (Special Assistant to the President for Regulatory Agencies).

**AFRICA** -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Jan. 12; partial summary released advocating recruitment of top-flight U.S. diplomatic personnel for African assignment and the development of an integrated, coordinated U.S. policy to new African states. Prepared under supervision of Ball and Sharon; Secretary Robert C. Good of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research at Johns Hopkins University.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE** -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Jan. 12; partial summary released advocating highest calibre U.S. diplomatic personnel and an expanded role for U.S. ambassadors, emphasizing their role as an extension of Presidential authority abroad and as executives in charge of manifold U.S. activities in the field. Prepared under supervision of Ball and Sharon; Secretary J. Robert Schaetzel, on leave from the office of the Secretary of State; contributors included former Ambassador to France and Germany David E.K. Bruce (Ambassador to Great Britain); Dean Harlan Cleveland of the Syracuse University School of Public Administration (Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs); Columbia Professor Richard E. Neustadt and Dean Don K. Price of the Harvard University School of Public Administration (part-time advisors to the President on organization of the Federal Government).

**U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY** -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Jan. 12; partial summary released suggesting that the Director of U.S.I.A. be designated principal advisor to the President and Secretary of State on international informational and cultural matters and be made a member of the National Security Council, and that legislation be sought to establish a career service for U.S. information personnel. Prepared under supervision of Ball and Sharon; Secretaries Lloyd Free, director of the Institute for International Social Research, and W. Phillip Davison of the Rand Corp.; contributors included vice president Edward R. Murrow of the Columbia Broadcasting System (Director, U.S.I.A.); and Cleveland (see Department of State, above).

**DISARMAMENT** -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Jan. 12; partial summary released recommending a semi-autonomous U.S. disarmament agency and thorough debate within the new Administration on disarmament before taking public positions. Prepared under supervision of Ball and Sharon; Secretary Jerome Spingarn, disarmament expert for the National Planning Assn.; consultants included Neustadt (see Department of State, above), and Nitze (see National Security, above).

**BALANCE OF PAYMENTS** -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Dec. 27; not released; prepared under the supervision of Ball, its chief author, and Sharon; Secretary Myer Rashish, former economist for the House Ways and Means Committee (Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs); chief consultants included Nitze (see National Security, above) and Robert V. Roosa (Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs).

**FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY** (divided into two parts, one on foreign aid programs and another on foreign trade) -- Requested Nov. 24; submitted Jan. 12, partial summary released. Prepared under the supervision of Ball and Sharon. Secretaries Rashish (see Balance of Payments, above), and George S. Springsteen, senior economist of

the Development Loan Fund on leave to the task force; consultants included J. Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard economist (Ambassador to India); Richard N. Gardner, professor at Columbia Law School (Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs); and Walt W. Rostow, professor of economic history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Deputy Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs).

**U.S. INFORMATION PROGRAMS** -- Requested in mid-November; submitted in two parts, Dec. 8 and 13; not released. Prepared by U.S.I.A. Near Eastern Affairs desk officer Thomas C. Sorensen (recently appointed U.S.I.A. Deputy Director for Policy and Plans). Sorensen is a brother of Theodore C. Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President.

**DEPRESSED AREAS** -- Requested Dec. 4; submitted Jan. 1; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 9). Chairman Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.); secretary Kennedy staff member Myer Feldman (Deputy Special Counsel to the President for Budgeting and Programming).

**EXCHANGE OF PERSONS** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 9; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 73). Prepared by Prof. James C. Davis of the University of Michigan.

**INDIA** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 14; not released. Chairman Max F. Millikan, director of the M.I.T. Center for International Studies.

**LATIN AMERICA** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted about Jan. 6; not released. Prepared by former Assistant Secretary of State Adolph A. Berle Jr. (Jan. 31 appointed chairman of Kennedy task force to coordinate U.S. Latin American policies).

**SPACE PROGRAMS** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 11; excerpts released (1961 Weekly Report p. 74). Chairman Jerome B. Wiesner of M.I.T. (Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology); consultants included Kenneth E. BeLieu, staff director, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee (Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Material).

**AMERICAN ECONOMY** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 5; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 44). Chairman M.I.T. economist Paul A. Samuelson; members included Walter W. Heller, professor of economics at the University of Minnesota (Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers); and James Tobin, professor of economics at Yale University (Member, Council of Economic Advisers).

**EDUCATION** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 6; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 45). Chairman Frederick Hovde, president of Purdue University.

**HEALTH AND SOCIAL SECURITY** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 10; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 72). Chairman Wilbur J. Cohen, University of Michigan professor (Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Legislation).

**HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 7; summary released (1961 Weekly Report p. 73). Chairman Joseph P. Murray, president of Queens (N.Y.) Community College and former New York Housing Commissioner (Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board).

**TAX POLICY** -- Requested Dec. 6; submitted Jan. 9; not released (Weekly Report p. 44). Chairman Stanley Sterling Surrey, Harvard Law School professor (Assistant Secretary of the Treasury); members included Mortimer Caplin, professor at the University of Virginia Law School (Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service).

**PEACE CORPS** -- Requested mid-December; submitted Jan. 7; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 71); Chairman Millikan (see India, above).

**ECONOMIC POLICY** -- Requested early January; submitted Jan. 24; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 217). Chairman Allan Sproul, former head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. (The reported purpose of the Sproul task force was to give conservative economists an opportunity to present the new Administration with alternatives to liberal programs presented in the Samuelson report on the American economy).

**AGRICULTURE (OVER-ALL)** -- Requested early January; submitted Jan. 31; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 176). Chairman Lauren Soth, editorial page editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

**FEED GRAINS** -- Requested early January by Secretary of Agriculture-designate Orville L. Freeman; submitted Jan. 31; released (1961 Weekly Report p. 176). Chairman Fred V. Heinkel, president, Missouri Farmers Assn.

## Post-Inaugural Task Forces

Since his inauguration, President Kennedy has continued the practice of appointing non-governmental task forces on specific problems. The post-inaugural task forces appointed through March 15 are noted below:

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST, ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT** -- Requested Jan. 22; Chairman Calvert Magruder, former Chief Judge of the First Circuit Court of Appeals.

**NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS** -- Requested Jan. 25; Chairman J.B. Fisk, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories.

**INDIAN AFFAIRS** -- Requested early February by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; Chairman W.W. Keeler, executive vice president of the Phillips Petroleum Co.

**AVIATION GOALS** -- Requested March 3; Chairman Fred M. Glass, executive vice president, Empire State Building Corp., N.Y., N.Y. (This task force is called "Project Horizon.")

**AIRSPACE PROBLEMS** -- Requested March 9; Chairman Richard R. Hough of Cleveland, Ohio.

In addition, President Kennedy Feb. 10 announced the following men would serve as consultants on major issues affecting the structure and operations of government: Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense and Under Secretary of State; Sydney Stein Jr., Chicago investment counsellor formerly with the Bureau of the Budget; and Neustadt and Price (see Department of State, above). Neustadt and Price have been important advisors to Mr. Kennedy on governmental organization since his election.

## FEDERAL ROLE REMAINS BASIC ISSUE IN SCHOOL BILL FIGHT

Reports emanating from Washington in recent weeks have drawn public attention to lobbying campaigns for and against including a provision for loans to private and parochial schools in the Administration's proposed school-aid legislation (S 1021, HR 4970).

The main pressure on the school-aid bill, however, continues to come not from groups interested primarily in the religious issue but from the large, well-organized lobby groups which have been lobbying for and against federal aid to education for years.

This Fact Sheet identifies the principal lobby groups working for and against school-aid legislation and describes the tactics they have employed to influence the outcome of the fight in 1961. (For House hearings on the Administration's school bill, see Weekly Report p. 528; for discussion of the parochial school-aid issue, see Weekly Report p. 392; for religious affiliations of Members of Congress, see p. 626)

## Groups in Favor

Most prominent among the groups pressing for enactment of the Administration's \$2.3-billion school bill was the National Education Assn., a Washington-based organization representing about 750,000 dues-paying teachers, school administrators and professional employees of public elementary and secondary schools and state and privately-owned colleges and universities.

The NEA is in the forefront in insisting that a school-aid bill include payments for teachers' salaries as well as school construction, although an NEA spokesman told CQ the organization "would go along" with a bill covering construction only.

He also said the NEA, along with most other groups supporting the Kennedy school bill, opposed amendments providing parochial school loans and barring aid to segregated schools on the grounds that such amendments would jeopardize the bill's chances for enactment.

As in previous years, the NEA said it relied heavily on the "grassroots" approach to get its views across to Members of Congress. An NEA spokesman said the organization actually had outlobbied larger, better organized opponents of federal aid to education at the grassroots level. He said in many communities NEA units had convinced local Chambers of Commerce that a school-aid bill was needed, despite the anti-federal-aid stance taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. He pointed out that local school superintendents often were loyal members of the NEA and, at the same time, belonged to local Chambers of Commerce.

In addition to their efforts in local communities, the NEA maintains a staff of paid lobbyists in Washington who describe their job as that of keeping Members of Congress supplied with educational materials, contacting new and uncommitted Members and countering the arguments of opponents of federal school-aid.

During the first six months of 1960, the NEA spent \$77,913 for lobbying, according to reports filed with

Congress under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. An NEA spokesman said the organization probably would spend about the same amount in 1961. The 1960 first-half figure topped all other pressure groups' reported spending.

Working with the NEA in a loose confederation of groups favoring federal school-aid were, according to the NEA official, the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO), AFL-CIO national headquarters, American Council on Education, American Assn. of University Women, American Assn. of School Administrators, American Council of Jewish Women, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Farmers Union, Americans for Democratic Action, American Civil Liberties Union, American Library Assn., American Nurses Assn., American Vocational Assn., American Veterans Committee and several industrial unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO, including the United Auto Workers, Textile Workers International Union, United Rubber Workers and International Union of Electrical Workers.

Despite the high degree of support for aid to education among most of the AFL-CIO industrial unions, the NEA spokesman said, his organization had never been able to build up much support among the building and crafts unions. This was ironic, he pointed out, as the building unions would benefit economically from a federal school construction program.

Despite the common goal of all the organizations in favor of a school-aid bill, the NEA representative said they were not as well organized or as "closely knit" as the groups opposed to federal aid. This view was shared by a spokesman for the American Federation of Teachers. Both said, however, that as the bill nears the crucial stages in Congress, the organizations supporting it would work together more closely to line up the votes necessary to put it over.

Both the NEA spokesman and the AFT representative referred to the slightly strained relationship between the NEA and the AFL-CIO lobbyists, apparently a result of the fact that the two groups compete for membership. The AFT, which represents about 70,000 teachers affiliated with the AFL-CIO, claims it is the largest voluntary teachers' organization. Membership in the NEA, it said, is required in certain states and localities, in order for a teacher to get a job. The AFT also said the NEA was dominated by school administrators.

Helping to unite the NEA, the AFT and other organizations favoring enactment of a school-aid bill is the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, a non-governmental, informal clearing house of information for liberal-minded groups. Operated by the organizations themselves, the Committee meets regularly in Washington to discuss ways of promoting liberal legislation. As the AFT spokesman explained, meetings are open to "any organization that shares our general point of view."

Several groups working for the enactment of the Administration's school bill attended the Committee's latest scheduled meeting April 3. Representatives of the

AFT, NEA, American Assn. of University Women, National Farmers Union, Young Women's Christian Assn., American Church Women's Council, American Council of Jewish Women and the American Nurses Assn. and others traded information on the progress of the education bill and attempted to assess the number of votes they could count on in Congress.

## Groups Opposed

Pressure groups working for the defeat of a federal school-aid bill are just as dedicated in their lobbying efforts as the NEA and its allies. And, as the NEA spokesman pointed out, the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., the National Assn. of Manufacturers and other groups frequently opposed to federal welfare spending are more closely knit than the aid-to-education bloc and probably are making better use of the lobbying tools at their command.

The national Chamber, the N.A.M. and the rest of the anti-federal-aid bloc were adamantly opposed to a school bill in 1960 and earlier, but they have been forced to step up their lobbying campaigns in 1961 because of the firm commitment of the Kennedy Administration to the enactment of a school-aid bill. Federal aid to education never was high on the legislative priority list of the Eisenhower Administration.

The U.S. Chamber, the most active of the anti-federal-aid organizations, has built its lobbying offensive around its contention that there is no acute classroom shortage in the U.S. and that teachers' salaries are adequate. What deficiencies there are, the Chamber says, are being met through the action at the state and local levels.

Defeat of the Kennedy school bill was a priority item during the Chamber's recently completed annual "aircade," a series of legislative conferences conducted by members of the Chamber's Washington staff in cities throughout the country. The 1961 arcade, a Chamber spokesman said, visited 12 cities, drawing 800-1,000 businessmen, professional men and civic leaders in each community and surrounding territories. The cities visited were Worcester, Mass.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Detroit, Mich.; Birmingham, Ala.; Tulsa, Okla.; Wichita, Kan.; Omaha, Neb.; Los Angeles, Hollywood, and Oakland, Calif.; Anchorage, Alaska and Honolulu, Hawaii. The Administration's school bill was the first topic of discussion in each city, the Chamber official said.

The purpose of the Chamber's aircares is to get conservative business and professional men interested in political issues at the local level. Armed with information compiled by the Chamber's legislative staff in Washington, these individuals would be expected to do missionary work among their employees and neighbors in their respective communities and to urge their fellow citizens to promote the Chamber's position on legislation in letters to their Representatives and Senators and to join in public discussions of major issues.

When questioned about allegations that some local Chambers of Commerce had deserted the national Chamber on the school bill and had gone on record as favoring federal aid for school construction because a building program might stimulate business in their communities, a spokesman for the national Chamber said this probably was true. The national Chamber does not represent all local and state Chambers of Commerce, he

said, but speaks for the "vast majority." The Chamber's position on legislative issues, he said, was reached at its annual conventions and had to be approved by two-thirds of its membership.

Working closely with the Chamber on the Kennedy school bill and other legislation, the spokesman said, were several other organizations dedicated to limiting the power of the Federal Government. Officials of the Chamber met weekly with representatives of the National Assn. of Manufacturers, Investment Bankers Assn. of America, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Legion, American Medical Assn. and the National Assn. of Real Estate Boards to swap information and contacts, he said. At each meeting, the spokesman said, the organizations represented would take up an "issue of the week" which generally was an issue on which each of the organizations represented had taken a similar stand. Federal aid to education was a current "issue of the week," he said. Other recent "issues of the week" medical care for the aged, public housing and urban renewal, the federal budget, minimum wage and unemployment compensation.

Although the AMA was listed by the Chamber as a participant in these weekly strategy sessions, an AMA spokesman said the association had never taken a position on federal aid to education and had not lobbied against the Administration's school bill. Sen. Maurine B. Neuberger (D Ore.) March 5 said the AMA had agreed to aid the Chamber in its campaign against the school bill in return for support in the fight against legislation providing medical care for Social Security beneficiaries. The AMA denied the allegation. (Weekly Report p. 395)

## Church, NAACP Pressures

An official of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the organization-spokesman for the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the U.S., April 3 told CQ the Church had not changed its position and still intended to oppose the Kennedy school bill unless it was amended to include loans for parochial schools. A check of Congressional offices March 31 and April 3 indicated that mail continued to come in supporting the Catholic position. The volume of letters in favor of the public-schools-only position of President Kennedy had begun to increase.

A sample of comments:

Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R N.Y.) -- "nine-to-one in favor of parochial schools...anti-church mail has picked up."

Rep. John Brademas (D Ind.) -- "Good deal of mail on school bill from outside district...extreme reactions from people both for and against parochial school loans."

Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D Pa.) -- "Most mail coming from Presbyterians" in opposition to parochial school loans.

Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D Conn.) -- "Four or five-to-one in favor of loans to parochial schools."

Sen. Frank J. Lausche (D Ohio) -- "Virtually unaffected by church-state controversy...most mail opposed to any federal aid at all."

Sen. Leverett Saltonstall (R Mass.) -- "Three-fourths of all mail on school bill against including parochial schools."

Few Congressional offices said they were receiving much mail supporting and amendment barring aid to segregated schools. But Clarence Mitchell, Washington director of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People, told CQ April 4 that there was "as much interest as ever" among Negroes. He said it would be a "calamity" if a school bill without an anti-segregation amendment were adopted.

**Special Report:**

# Religious Affiliations of Members of 87th Congress

(As of March 22, 1961)

## KEY AND SUMMARY

PROTESTANT	Symbol	Senate	House	Total	PROTESTANT	Symbol	Senate	House	Total
General	Prot.	4	19	23	Lutheran	L	4	17	21
Apostolic Christian	AC	0	1	1	Methodist	M	19	77	96
Baptist	B	13	48	61	Presbyterian	P	11	60	71
Central Schwenkfelder	Sch.	0	1	1	Reformed Church in America	Ref.	1	0	1
Christian Church	CC	0	3	3	Seventh-Day Baptist	SDB	1	0	1
Christian Scientist	CS	0	4	4	Society of Friends	F	1	1	2
Church of Christ	C of C	0	5	5	Unitarian	U	5	4	9
Congregational Christian	C	7	18	25	United Presbyterian	UP	0	1	1
Cumberland Presbyterian	CP	0	1	1					
Disciples of Christ	D	2	8	10	Protestant Totals		85	329	414
Episcopal	E	13	53	66					
Evangelical and Reformed Church	ERC	0	2	2	Roman Catholic	RC	12	88	100
Evangelical Free	EF	0	2	2	Jewish Congregation	J	1	11	12
Evangelical and United Brethren	EUB	0	1	1	Sikh	S	0	1	1
Latter-Day Saints (Mormons)	LDS	3	3	6	Not Given	--	2	3	5
Latter-Day Saints (Reorganized)	LDS(R)	1	0	1	Vacancies		0	5	5

SOURCE: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

FAITH		FAITH		FAITH		House
FAITH		FAITH		FAITH		
<b>ALABAMA</b>		19 Holifield	D	<b>HAWAII</b>		
3 Andrews	B	17 King	E	AL Inouye	M	
1 Boykin	M	26 Roosevelt	E	<b>IDAHO</b>		
7 Elliott	M	16 Bell	P	2 Harding	LDS	
2 Grant	M	21 Hiestand	C	1 Pfost	M	
9 Huddleston	E	18 Hosmer	E	<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
8 Jones	M	24 Lipscomb	B	25 Gray	B	
5 Rains	B	15 McDonough	RC	21 Mack	RC	
4 Roberts	B	25 Rousselot	CS	24 Price	RC	
6 Selden	E	20 Smith	M	23 Shipley	B	
<b>ALASKA</b>		<b>COLORADO</b>		16 Anderson	EF	
AL Rivers	Prot.	4 Aspinall	M	17 Arends	M	
<b>ARIZONA</b>		1 Rogers	B	19 Chipfield	C	
2 Vacancy		3 Chenoweth	B	20 Findley	C	
1 Rhodes	M	2 Dominick	E	14 Hoffman	RC	
<b>ARKANSAS</b>		<b>CONNECTICUT</b>		15 Mason	Prot.	
5 Alford	E	1 Doddario	RC	18 Michel	AC	
1 Gathings	B	3 Gaiamo	RC	22 Springer	P	
4 Harris	B	AL Kowalski	RC	<b>Chicago Cook County</b>		
2 Mills	M	5 Monagan	RC	1 Dawson	CS	
6 Vacancy		2 Seely-Brown	E	12 Finnegan	RC	
3 Trimble	M	4 Sibal	C	5 Kluczynski	RC	
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		<b>DELAWARE</b>		7 Libonati	RC	
7 Cohelan	E	AL McDowell	P	3 Murphy	RC	
14 Hagen	Prot.	<b>FLORIDA</b>		6 O'Brien	RC	
2 Johnson	P	2 Bennett	D	2 O'Hara	RC	
11 McFall	E	4 Foscill	Prot.	11 Pucinski	RC	
1 Miller C.W.	P	7 Haley	M	8 Rostenkowski	RC	
8 Miller G.P.	RC	5 Herlong	M	9 Yates	J	
3 Moss	Prot.	8 Matthews	P	13 Church	M	
29 Sound	S	6 Rogers	M	10 Collier	M	
5 Shelley	RC	3 Sikes	M	4 Derwinski	RC	
27 Sheppard	M	1 Cramer	M	<b>INDIANA</b>		
12 Sisk	C of C	<b>GEORGIA</b>		3 Brademas	M	
6 Baldwin	P	8 Blitch	M	8 Denton	M	
10 Gubser	P	5 Davis J.C.	M	1 Madden	RC	
4 Mailliard	E	7 Davis J.W.	P	4 Adair	M	
13 Teague	Prot.	4 Flynt	M	7 Bray	F	
28 Utt	P	3 Forrester	B	11 Bruce	L	
30 Wilson	B	1 Hagan	B	5 Vacancy		
9 Younger	C	9 Landrum	B	2 Halleck	M	
<b>Los Angeles Co.</b>		2 Pilcher	M	10 Harvey	CC	
22 Corman	M	10 Stephens	P	6 Roudebush	CC	
23 Doyle	C	6 Vinson	M	9 Wilson	M	

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

FAITH		FAITH		FAITH		FAITH	
6 Morrison	E	<b>NEBRASKA</b>	L	5 Scott	P	6 McMillan	B
5 Passman	B	3 Beermann	E	12 Taylor	B	2 Riley	M
7 Thompson	RC	2 Cunningham	E	11 Whitener	M	1 Rivers	E
3 Willis	RC	4 Martin	P	10 Jonas	M	<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>	
<b>MAINE</b>		1 Weaver	P	<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>		2 Berry	C
1 Garland	E	<b>NEVADA</b>	Prot.	AL Nygaard	L	1 Reifel	E
3 McIntire	B	AL Baring		AL Short	E	<b>TENNESSEE</b>	
2 Tupper	M	<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>		<b>OHIO</b>		6 Bass	M
<b>MARYLAND</b>		2 Bass	E	9 Ashley	E	9 Davis	B
2 Brewster	E	1 Merrow	M	11 Cook	RC	8 Everett	CP
4 Fallon	RC	<b>NEW JERSEY</b>	RC	20 Feighan	RC	4 Evins	C of C
7 Friedel	J	11 Addonizio	RC	18 Hays	P	3 Frazier	M
3 Garmatz	ERC	14 Daniels	RC	19 Kirwan	RC	5 Loser	B
1 Johnson	E	13 Gallagher	RC	10 Moeller	L	7 Murray	M
5 Lankford	E	8 Joelson	J	21 Vanik	RC	2 Baker	P
6 Mathias	E	10 Rodino	RC	17 Asbbrook	B	1 Vacancy	
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>		4 Thompson	RC	14 Ayres	M	<b>TEXAS</b>	
2 Boland	RC	3 Auchincloss	P	8 Betts	E	3 Beckworth	B
13 Burke	RC	1 Cahill	RC	22 Bolton	P	2 Brooks	M
4 Donohue	RC	6 Dwyer	Prot.	16 Bow	P	17 Burleson	C of C
7 Lane	RC	5 Frelinghuysen	E	7 Broum	M	22 Casey	Prot.
8 Macdonald	RC	2 Glenn	P	2 Clancy	RC	7 Dowdy	M
12 McCormack	RC	9 Osners	C	12 Devine	M	21 Fisher	C of C
11 O'Neill	RC	12 Wallhauser	M	6 Harsha	P	13 Ikard	E
3 Philbin	RC	7 Widnall	E	5 Latta	Prot.	20 Kilday	RC
6 Bates	RC	<b>NEW MEXICO</b>	RC	4 McCulloch	P	15 Kilgore	M
1 Conte	RC	AL Montoya	P	23 Minshall	Prot.	19 Mohon	M
10 Curtis	E	AL Morris	P	15 Moorehead	P	1 Patman	B
9 Keith	C	<b>NEW YORK</b>		13 Mosher	C	11 Poage	U
14 Martin	--	41 Dulski	RC	3 Schenck	M	4 Rayburn	B
5 Morse	C	30 O'Brien	RC	1 Scherer	CS	18 Rogers	E
<b>MICHIGAN</b>		1 Pike	C of C	<b>OKLAHOMA</b>		16 Rutherford	B
7 O'Hara	RC	32 Stratton	P	3 Albert	M	3 Teague	B
12 Bennett	RC	27 Barry	P	2 Edmondson	P	8 Thomas	M
18 Broomfield	M	3 Becker	RC	5 Jarman	P	9 Thompson	E
10 Cederberg	EF	2 Derounian	P	4 Stead	M	10 Thornberry	M
6 Chamberlain	Prot.	26 Dooley	RC	6 Wickersham	D	12 Wright	P
5 Ford	E	43 Goodell	E	1 Belcher	M	14 Young	RC
9 Griffin	C	33 Kilburn	M	<b>OREGON</b>		5 Alger	D
8 Harvey	P	31 King	RC	3 Green	D	<b>UTAH</b>	
4 Hoffman	L	40 Miller	RC	2 Ullman	P	2 King	LDS
3 Jobansen	C	39 Ostertag	Prot.	4 Durno	Prot.	1 Peterson	LDS
11 Knox	P	42 Pillion	P	1 Norblad	P	<b>VERMONT</b>	
2 Meader	M	34 Pirmie	Prot.	<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>		AL Stafford	C
<b>Detroit - Wayne County</b>		35 Riehlman	B	25 Clark	P	<b>VIRGINIA</b>	
13 Diggs	B	37 Robison	M	21 Dent	RC	4 Abbitt	B
15 Dingell	RC	28 St. George	E	11 Flood	RC	1 Downing	E
17 Griffiths	Prot.	36 Taber	E	30 Holland	RC	3 Gary	B
16 Lesinski	RC	38 Weis	E	28 Moorhead	E	2 Hardy	M
1 Machrowicz	RC	29 Wharton	M	26 Morgan	M	7 Harrison	E
14 Rabaut	RC	<b>New York City</b>		14 Rhodes	L	9 Jennings	M
<b>MINNESOTA</b>		5 Addabbo	RC	15 Walter	L	8 Smith	E
8 Blatnik	RC	8 Anfuso	RC	29 Corbett	P	5 Tuck	B
4 Karth	P	24 Buckley	RC	8 Curtin	E	10 Broyhill	L
6 Marshall	Prot.	12 Carey	RC	9 Dague	P	6 Poff	P
7 Andersen	L	11 Celler	J	12 Fenton	C	<b>WASHINGTON</b>	
5 Judd	C	7 Delaney	RC	27 Fulton	UP	3 Hansen	CS
9 Langen	L	19 Farbastein	J	23 Gavin	E	7 Magnuson	M
3 MacGregor	P	23 Gilbert	RC	19 Goodling	EUB	5 Horam	P
2 Nelsen	L	22 Healey	J	24 Kearns	L	4 May	E
1 Quie	L	6 Holtzman	J	7 Milliken	P	1 Pelly	E
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>		10 Kelly	RC	16 Vacancy		6 Tollefson	L
1 Abernethy	M	9 Keogh	RC	22 Saylor	ERC	2 Westland	P
6 Colmer	M	13 Multer	J	17 Schneebeli	E	<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>	
3 Smith	M	16 Powell	B	13 Schweikher	Sch.	3 Bailey	B
2 Whitten	P	14 Rooney	RC	10 Scranton	P	4 Hechler	E
4 Williams	B	20 Ryan	RC	20 Van Zandt	L	5 Kee	E
5 Winstead	B	18 Santangelo	RC	18 Whalley	P	6 Slack	P
<b>MISSOURI</b>		21 Zelenko	J	<b>Philadelphia City</b>		2 Stagers	M
5 Bolling	E	25 Fino	RC	1 Barrett	RC	1 Moore	M
9 Cannon	B	4 Halpern	J	3 Byrne	RC	<b>WISCONSIN</b>	
6 Hull	CC	17 Lindsay	P	2 Granahan	RC	9 Johnson	L
8 Ichord	B	15 Ray	U	5 Green	RC	2 Kastenmeier	--
10 Jones	D	<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>		4 Nix	B	5 Reuss	E
1 Karsten	E	9 Alexander	P	6 Toll	J	4 Zablocki	RC
11 Moulder	--	1 Bonner	E	<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>		8 Byrnes	RC
4 Randall	M	4 Cooley	B	2 Fogarty	RC	7 Laird	P
3 Sullivan	RC	2 Fountain	P	1 St. Germain	RC	10 O'Konski	RC
2 Curtis	U	3 Henderson	P	<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>		1 Schadeberg	C
7 Hall	B	8 Kitchin	B	4 Ashmore	B	3 Thomson	P
<b>MONTANA</b>		6 Kornegay	M	3 Dorn	B	6 Van Pelt	Prot.
1 Olsen	M	7 Lennon	B	5 Hemphill	P	<b>WYOMING</b>	
2 Battin	C					AL Harrison	U

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

# Religious Affiliations of 87th Congress - Senate

(As of March 22, 1961)

## KEY AND SUMMARY

PROTESTANT	Symbol	Senate	House	Total	PROTESTANT	Symbol	Senate	House	Total
General	Prot.	4	19	23	Lutheran	L	4	17	21
Apostolic Christian	AC	0	1	1	Methodist	M	19	77	96
Baptist	B	13	48	61	Presbyterian	P	11	60	71
Central Schwenkfelder	Sch.	0	1	1	Reformed Church in America	Ref.	1	0	1
Christian Church	CC	0	3	3	Seventh-Day Baptist	SDB	1	0	1
Christian Scientist	CS	0	4	4	Society of Friends	F	1	1	2
Church of Christ	C of C	0	5	5	Unitarian	U	5	4	9
Congregational Christian	C	7	18	25	United Presbyterian	UP	0	1	1
Cumberland Presbyterian	CP	0	1	1					
Disciples of Christ	D	2	8	10	Protestant Totals		85	329	414
Episcopal	E	13	53	66					
Evangelical and Reformed Church	ERC	0	2	2	Roman Catholic	RC	12	88	100
Evangelical Free	EF	0	2	2	Jewish Congregation	J	1	11	12
Evangelical and United Brethren	EUB	0	1	1	Sikh	S	0	1	1
Latter-Day Saints (Mormons)	LDS	3	3	6	Not Given	--	2	3	5
Latter-Day Saints (Reorganized)	LDS(R)	1	0	1	Vacancies		0	5	5

SOURCE: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

FAITH		FAITH		FAITH		Senate	
						FAITH	
ALABAMA	M	INDIANA	L	NEBRASKA	P		
Hill	M	Hartke	L	Curtis	U		
Sparkman		Capehart		Hruska			
ALASKA	Prot.	IOWA	M	NEVADA	M		
Bartlett	--	Hickenlooper	RC	Bible	LDS		
Gruening		Miller		Cannon			
ARIZONA	E	KANSAS	B	NEW HAMPSHIRE	C	SOUTH CAROLINA	
Hayden	E	Carlson	M	Bridges	C	Johnston	B
Goldwater		Schoeppel		Cotton		Thurmond	B
ARKANSAS	D	KENTUCKY	B	NEW JERSEY	U	SOUTH DAKOTA	
Fulbright	B	Cooper	E	Williams	P	Case	M
McClellan		Morton		Case		Mundt	M
CALIFORNIA	M	LOUISIANA	P	NEW MEXICO	P	TENNESSEE	
Engle	E	Ellender	M	Anderson	RC	Gore	B
Kuchel		Long		Chavez		Kefauver	B
COLORADO	Prot.	MAINE	RC	NEW YORK	J	TEXAS	
Corroll	E	Muskie	M	Javits	P	Blakley	P
Allott		Smith		Keating		Yarborough	B
CONNECTICUT	RC	MARYLAND	E	NORTH CAROLINA	P	UTAH	
Dodd	E	Beall	M	Ervin		Moss	LDS
Busb		Butler		Jordan		Bennett	LDS
DELAWARE	M	MASSACHUSETTS	RC	NORTH DAKOTA	C	VERMONT	
Boggs	M	Smith	U	Burdick	LDS (R)	Aiken	Prot.
Williams		Saltonstall		Young		Prouty	C
FLORIDA	M	MICHIGAN	RC	OHIO	RC	VIRGINIA	
Holland	M	Hart	RC	Lausche	Prot.	Byrd	E
Smathers		McNamara		Young		Robertson	B
GEORGIA	M	MINNESOTA	C	OKLAHOMA	B	WASHINGTON	
Russell	B	Humphrey	RC	Kerr	E	Jackson	P
Talmadge		McCarthy		Moroney		Magnuson	L
HAWAII	D	MISSISSIPPI	M	OREGON	C	WEST VIRGINIA	
Long	C	Eastland	P	Morse	U	Byrd	B
Fong		Stennis		Neuberger		Randolph	SDB
IDAHO	P	MISSOURI	B	PENNSYLVANIA	U	WISCONSIN	
Church	--	Long	E	Clark	E	Proxmire	E
Dworsbak		Symington		Scott		Wiley	L
ILLINOIS	F	MONTANA	RC	RHODE ISLAND	RC	WYOMING	
Douglas	Ref.	Mansfield	M	Pastore	E	Hickey	RC
Dirksen		Metcalf		Pell		McGee	P

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics



## What's Ahead?

*Dates are listed as released by sources and are sometimes subject to change.*

### Committee Hearings

- April 10-11 -- SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM EXTENSION AND ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS DAIRY PROGRAM, House Agriculture, Dairy and Poultry Subc.  
April 11 -- PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK (S 4) Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Lands Subc.  
April 12 -- CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK (S 77) Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Lands Subc.  
April 13 -- LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES (S 1070), Senate Post Office and Civil Service, Health Benefits and Life Insurance Subc.  
April 13-14 -- IDENTICAL BIDDING IN THE ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subc.  
April 17-18 -- LOANS FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS (S 1482), Senate Labor and Public Welfare, Education Subc.

### Political Events

- April 18 -- New Jersey Governorship primary.  
May 2 -- Arizona 2nd Congressional District special election.  
May 27 -- DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, birthday ball for President John F. Kennedy, National Guard Armory, Washington, D.C.  
June 3 -- Texas special Senate election run-off.

### Other Events

- April 12-13 -- Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of West Germany, visit with President John F. Kennedy, Washington, D.C.  
April 12-14 -- BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEERS, West Coast union meeting, Las Vegas.  
April 13 -- NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN., retail clinic, Washington, D.C.  
April 13-15 -- CONGRESS OF FREEDOM, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
April 17-19 -- NATIONAL WATERSHED CONGRESS, Ramada Inn, Tucson, Arizona.  
April 19-22 -- AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, annual convention, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

- April 20 -- ASNE convention, President John F. Kennedy addresses a luncheon meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel.  
April 21 -- ASNE convention, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon addresses a luncheon meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel.  
April 22 -- ASNE convention, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg and Secretary of Commerce Luther M. Hodges address a luncheon meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel.  
April 22 -- ASNE convention, Secretary of State Dean Rusk addresses a banquet meeting, Statler Hilton Hotel.  
April 22-26 -- NATIONAL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ASSN., mid-year meeting, Sheraton Dallas Hotel, Dallas.  
April 24-28 -- AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, annual convention, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
April 24-27 -- AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN., 75th annual convention, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York.  
April 25-27 -- AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, convention, Granada Hotel, San Antonio, Texas.  
April 30-May 3 -- CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S., 49th annual meeting, Washington, D.C.  
May 1 -- BOILER MAKERS, IRON SHIP BUILDERS, BLACKSMITHS, FORGERS & HELPERS (AFL-CIO), convention, Lafayette Hotel, Long Beach, Calif.  
May 12-14 -- AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, annual convention, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
May 14-17 -- NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL, INC., mid-year meeting, The Americana Hotel, Bal Harbour, Florida.  
May 14-17 -- TEXAS INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS AND ROYALTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, 15th annual meeting, Midland, Texas.  
May 16-17 -- GEORGE W. NORRIS NATIONAL CENTENNIAL, national conference, Washington, D.C.  
May 19-21 -- AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, national convention, Sheraton Park Hotel, New York, N.Y.  
May 21-27 -- NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS INC., international board meeting, Victoria Falls Hotel, Victoria Falls, Rhodesia, Africa.  
May 23-27 -- NAVY LEAGUE OF THE U.S., 59th annual convention, Washington, D.C.  
May 31-June 2 -- President John F. Kennedy in France.

*Check your Congressional Quarterly Almanacs for additional details and background information on the news of Congress appearing in the Weekly Reports. Published since 1945, the CQ Almanac is fully indexed and cross referenced.*



**Regulatory Agencies** With little attention from the press and public, the federal regulatory agencies exert significant control over the economy through their oversight of such areas as transportation, communications, labor relations and the market price of money. But the agencies have been beset by complaints of interminable delays, conflicting responsibilities and outside influence which some critics say have contributed to the nation's economic slowdown. Recommendations for reform are due shortly from both Congress and the President. CQ's background story reviews 21 major problem areas on which the reform proposals are expected to concentrate. (Page 601)

### Grants to States

Although Federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments and individuals declined in fiscal 1960 for the first time since 1953, the basic trend for such programs is upward. President Kennedy's proposals add up to a strong endorsement for new or expanded grants programs, and given probable Congressional support, total grants are likely to pass the \$10 billion mark in 1961 or shortly thereafter. CQ's Fact Sheet reviews grants to date and tabulates allocations to each state under the nine largest programs in fiscal 1960. (Page 615)

### School Bill Pressures

Letters continued to pour into Capitol Hill supporting and opposing the Catholic Bishops' demand for federal loans to parochial schools. The main pressure on the Administration's school-aid proposal, however, continues to come from such well-known lobbying groups as the National Education Assn., which has gone all out for federal grants for public school construction and teachers' salaries, and the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., which is equally determined to block any kind of school-aid bill. (Page 624)

### Task Forces Appraised

President Kennedy broke fresh ground in American history by appointing, before his inauguration, a total of 29 special task forces to report to him on a wide range of domestic and foreign policy areas. A CQ Fact Sheet reviews the origin of the task force idea, how the task forces were chosen and put into operation, and the role they have played as seen by Administration officials. Also listed are the chairmen and dates of appointment and reporting for each group, and personnel who subsequently received high Administration posts. (Page 620)

### Religious Affiliations

The 87th Congress has 414 Protestant Members and 100 who are Roman Catholic. In addition, Congress includes 12 Jews, one Sikh and five Members for whom no affiliation is listed. In the Senate alone, a CQ compilation shows 85 Protestants and 12 Catholics. In the House, the line-up for the two major groups is Protestant, 329, and Catholic, 88. For the complete breakdown, see p. 626.

### Political Notes

Rep. Frank Chelf (D Ky.) announced he would begin seeking signatures for a discharge petition to force a House vote on legislation to increase the House membership. House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D Texas) is opposed.... Republican John Tower and Sen. William A. Blakley (D), both avowed conservatives, ran ahead of the field in the Texas special Senate election for Vice President Johnson's former seat. The contest must be decided in a run-off election.... Republicans failed in a bid to win the St. Louis Mayor's office, but substantially increased their vote from 1957.... Democrats ran ahead in Michigan off-year elections. (Page 610)

### Around the Capitol

The Third Supplemental Appropriations bill and an extension of the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans made to railroads were sent to the President.... The Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on bills to improve exchange programs and the Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and Aging reported on its 1960 studies and recommended legislation.... Following a five-year study, the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health urged Congress to establish a national mental health program, using both federal and state funds. (Pages 609, 612, 614)

8  
n  
e  
)  
. ,  
e  
. ,  
s  
n  
r

n  
e  
is  
gn  
to  
e  
on  
...  
on  
to  
ng  
)